AIMLESS AND POINTLESS WRITINGS

written by: Onionfluff

This book will have no meaning, no foundation, nothing of the sort. Simply writings off the top of my head as i try to think of something, perhaps a diary. 8/13/26 there is one thing i must say on utopia, the idea of a utopia itself, the utopian experience and being, utopia in general and any sort of perfect world is by-nature and de-facto alienating and oppressive, oppressive in the ways i spoke of before in 'fragments of an absolute' and alienating in the ways i spoke before in 'fragments of an absolute' AND in the sense that, too, it requires the abolition of the self, of community (8/23/26 2:52am, you will later see that the abolition of community itself is a problem... that is, it requires the end of passionate expression, or, the passions as liberated, the passions at all, and desire, necrophilia... the death of community is the denial of the necrophilic nature of human desire, that is, desiring one's own corpse, the other's corpse, and the beheaded corpse of god with her hairy bush and mutilated penis, morphed in the shape of a vagina, or at least, what one can think of as similar to it. community is necrophilia, it is the realization of desire, of passions, and of our violative and corpse-obsessed tendencies, it is the expression of desire and passion itself. In the natural community, this is revealed as the alignment of passions, in the passionate community (better called the impossible community, the promised community, the liberated community, the rotting community, unalienated community, and true necrophilia) it is revealed as the abolition of alignment itself. Community's death is a repression of the passions, of desire, and necrophilia... my puritanical nature and former hatred of filth you will see later on, but now, i realize that god's suicide is a result of her growing filth-obsession, auto-necrophilic, the passionate community is god raping her own corpse, not the purifying of god's violative nature or self-destructive nature but, instead, its natural result, that is, an infinite loop of the beheaded woman playing in her mind. In fact, the filth is not the bad, there is no bad, the 'good' is the end result of the 'bad', of filth, it is teleological and never moral, all of this is necessary for the moment she ultimately slits her throat and attempts to cut her own head off to immitate the unfortunate soul and victim who, herself, lacked a head, and the eyes that had to witness it, impaled and bloodied. It is her. That was God, god herself, the hon. Thus, do not deny your desires, you have no reason to, do what you must and what you will, what you want-- i am not against capitalism, against imperialism, against evil, i am against nothing at all, not even that, i am only one thing-- for communism. Communism is

not against anything, in fact, it is the end result of everything. One cannot be communist and hate capitalism, simply, one cannot believe in god and feel disgust when they walk on her scatological creation, the earth, that one who believes in god but will not eat her turd, eat out her shitty asshole and bite off her penis, who will not rape her, does not believe in any god at all but 'the good one'... aka, delusion. Filth, there is filth, kiss it, fuck it. God is communism, the path to communism, YHWH is the revolutionary bordiga claimed she was, she is the very teleology herself, scatology, leading to death, or, apostolic socialism. but, really, apostolic socialism is the process and nothing more, the means are the ends and the ends are the means, the passionate community is the process of abolishing the passions, is the process of liberating the passions, is the process of god's auto-decapitation, it is the moment we all feel- of her extremely painful and orgasmic, miserable depressive yet overwhelmingly undescribable, death, or, process of dying, dying, her decay... passionate communism, no, COMMUNISM, is the community between the dying god and herself, communization is communism itself, there is nothing more, communism is only a perpetual state of communizing, even after the fall of capitalism, apostolic socialism is the perpetual state of god dying, her community with us, herself, in her dying, her raping, her rape, her suffering, her orgasm, her pleasure, community, apostolic socialism is this, perpetually, it is the ultimate perfection. I admit it, i love god! I love her so much! I wish to cannibalize her, tear her penis apart and consume it, i wish to rip her throat out and gobble it up, and thrust into her bleeding and teethless (i eat those too after all) mouth, and cumming all over her dying, never dead, dying... eternality is now perfection, eternal fleeting orgasmic suffering... if god is eternal, then she can eternally die, never dead, pleasure, eternal revolution, permanent revolution, MOTHERFUCKING TROTSKY POSADAS WA i hate trotsky but whatever. I love god so much, truly, so so much, i am deeply religious, i love her, i love her more than enything and anyone in the world, i would kill for her, i would kill myself for her, i would tear out my eyes for her and shove it up my anus, i would slit my penis vein and tear my balls open for her, i would eat her shit, i love her, i love, love , love ,love her like everything in the world, love! Fuck nick land, i hate him. 3:28am, let me compare this to sex, bdsm, tops and bottoms, and whatnot, though not really-- vaguely. I mean, the whining and the build-up, the rise, the desire, it is always better than the orgasm, the orgasm represents sure, the

top, but also the end, a fall back to bottom-- i propose, for god, and this is what god wants, because i want it, the abolition of the orgasm, or really, the end-- or, to make eternal whining, begging, want to release, build-up, rise, desires unfulfilled and thus fulfilled, contradictory, the estrogenized cock myth, that is, this is the new orgasm itself, the abolition of end to pleasure, there is no top and there is not bottom-- both literally in relationship forms with the abolition of societal power dynamics (not meaning the abolition of petplay or anything like that, probably... i am not marx, i dont fuckign know.), abuse, heterosexuality, and thus heteronormativity and homonormativity, but also in the sense i previously used it, that is, you will not cum in passionate communism.. alongside the abolition of pregnancy and birth / the trauma of birth, too cumming itself will be abolished, instead, continual painful orgasmic experience, begging for release, that is, an accelerating build-up that never ends, pure bliss, this is what god wants and, really, i do too. Grinding against the floor with a pathetic cock. God is used to erectile dysfunction, she never gets to cum but never gets to build-up either, the abolition of orgasm is the sexualization of (and de-castrating of, thus that modern erectile dysfunction is-- guess what--- not fun to have, actually, a pain and a horrible experience, and the abolition of the orgasm is thus the abolition of the erectile function and erectile dysfunction, it has no utility anymore, this goes the same for vaginas, i only say cock here because it is what god has) erectile dysfunction, the implication of 'function and dysfunction' in erectile dysfunctiom implies that erectile being serves only for a function, utility, and thus alignment-- orgasms and dysfunction and function alike falls for the genital with no purpose, or, a lack of productive purpose. Abolish, really, production, and reproduction, that is a necessity in the abolition of work-- not to make production for waste but to make production nonexistent.), and of nature, and to abolish these things or to deprive one from these things is to alienate them radically from all things (to make this especially known or obvious to the reader, i will simply say, the abolition of the self alienates the being from the self and thus, as an alienation, resurrects the self.. pol pot's attempted abolition of thr self shows us that the self is not able to be abolished, and so, neither nature or community. Beings are selves and so to alienate the being from itself, to strip the being from itself, to abolish the being, to alienate the self from itself, to strip the self from itself, to abolish the self, is a radical alienation, it is a selfless self, a beingless being, a(n alienating) paradox,

another impossibility of utopia, yes, but also, the realization that the self will always exist.)-- and too, thus, it is impossible to abolish these things as that same alienation recreates the self, first, and with self comes community and then nature. Community then (gradually) transforms into (or creates) economy one way or another at the same time as nature (gradually) transforms into (two, in which one is)(or creates) culture one way or another as well. thus the abolition of one's slavery is impossible, or, the abolition of (the) self-subsumption (of god) is an impossible goal. then, what is to be done? theopanist (not-so pantheist in reality, moreso theopanism) fourier-gnostic(revolutionarism(/reformism))(ism) failed not because of its untruth but because its truth leads to nothing, it is unsolvable, and so, a pointless thing to wonder about. "how to do the impossible" is a question the utopians have had for years, and one that, finally, in my realization, i have now asked(,) myself! So... one does what they can, that is, continue to learn and develop their ideas. First, bataille, then, more communizationist writings, then so on and whatnot, i plan with reading endnotes, sic, dauve, zeroworkists, all the same. Primitivism will not win this battle even if utopia has fallen, and truly, i guess reading from a bataillean position, one would tell me that 'utopia was always doomed to fall, thus the life of the icarian sur-eagle'... and i say, sure, i was never too wise, and i never am, and never will be, but sself-critique exists for a reason. Misery, suffering, perhaps, is just as good as utopia and pleasure and consensuality, and just as bad as utopia and pleasure and consensuality, maybe the distinction is not as far as i have thought and i only replicated the same repeated words of the kristos-satanists (the russian mormons, the "christians")... that's fine, maybe god likes her life, her rotting, maybe she is an auto-necrophiliac and an extreme masochist of the likes never seen before, perhaps there is no real suffering or misery, perhaps everything is as it wants to be and as it "should" be. Myy arguments may have, because of my utopianism, reeked of moralism. maybe i should play my part. Maybe I am God, and so are you, along with the scat and the filth and the nobles and the sun and the gold and the money and the pleasures and pain and the blood of the cut wrist and the dildo in the anus and the pee in the grass and the old man's face and it all, god is the conceptual unity of all as a single miserable girl, but perhaps, she is a coprophile in a pile of her own shit, perhaps she is the pile of her own shit, and really, it is not misery but filth, not decay but rot, the rotting of the corpse that has all its bodily waste expelled and rotting with

it, and all the "good" i once saw possible was the puritanic christian sun, the fourierist suppression of the anarchist (the same suppression i unfortunately fell for and advocated for in my utopianism, despite claiming it anarchist, which it was... only in a(n) ~~maoist country~~ anarchist commune is it illegal to be a(n) ~~maoist~~ anarchist, the mao-spontex truth. And, truthfully, it was anarchist anti-anarchism that fueled i and fourier alike and, now, i lay down the contradiction.). The "good" was a heterogeneity of nobility (all i am saying is inspired deeply, even if perhaps i am misunderstanding him which i most likely am, by bataille), the "miserable bad" was a heterogeneity of filth, the faultless tragedy was not, really, a tragedy but a cult-like devotion to filth (8/23/26: tragedy-less fault and faultless tragedy is one in the same thing, it is both tragic and a pleasure, we are both innocent and absolutely guilty of it, god is victim and violator, raped and rapist. All actions, i repeat, are equally innocent and guilty, are equally tragic and pleasuring, we are all responsible for everything and nothing-- we are slaves to ourselves, this is self-subsumption, the trinity is internal and external and is us ourselves-- passionate community is the mass suicide of jonestown as we are the issue, we self-abominations... We, self-subsumption, are self-subsumption, communism is our mass suicide, the abolition of alignment, liberation of passions, is death, not beyond life or death, but death, real death, there is no other. revolutionary suicide. God suffers and orgasms at her filth, herself, we are the same, we are also forced to do so by ourselves, self-oppression is not a portion of but instead the entirety of self-subsumption. the death of god is jim jones' mass suicide, again, apostolic socialism was right, I AM THE TRUTH. YE ARE ALL GODS. THE ONLY GOD IS COMMUNISM. God is her own death, suicide, another definition. sin, thus, outdated, we are wholely innocent and wholely guilty, azerate and the monad, yaldabaoth and lucifer, christ the mandaean. inspired by georges bataille's on nietzsche, sure i do not understand, but... the revolution, communization, is a temporary community with god's dying carcass, not yet dead, and the passionate community is community in death, revolutionary suicide, the community felt for only a second in jonestown, a tragic yet orgasmic one, just like god's life an djust like god's death... i had said, god lived miserable and will die miserable, now i understand, she lived orgasmic and miserable, and will die the same, carnaro! Q! Fuck, a spectacle, a situation, a beauty, a decay, a rot, the beheaded woman violated, that itself is the revolution, a feeling of disgust and attraction, of

miserable hatred and empathy mixed with inhumane wishes, the community of death, fearing being yourself decapitated and raped while praying and wishing for it, begging for it, but only I. To be beheaded and raped, a pleasure, a misery, a masochistic pleasure. God. Spasms. Morality, justice, must be disregarded, the school shooter as much as a victim as the victim of human trafficking, a racist trumpist maga fuck and a neo-nazi (disgusting) as much as a victim as the poor innocent child slaughtered in a homicide by a madman, who too, is a victim. The capitalist, the imperialist, the proletariatn savior (vindex), the o9aist, the fascist, the filth, the creep on the road, the alcoholic father who abuses her daughter, all equally victims and violators... moralism must be disregarded to accept such an absurd condition. After all, one would laugh at me or call me insane if i said a newborn was just as evil and innocent, harmed and harmful, as a homicidal maniac with no apparent mental issue... but, it is what it is, YHWH. She is, after all. Jim jones. But, if community and self-subsumption are one, or, community is the expression and encapsulation of self-subsumption, the community of the self-subsumed which, by definition, is self-subsumption therefore, self-subsumption is also the slavery of men to community, or really, the alienation of community from itself. Community is its own alienation insofar as it is the non-slavery of beings, yet, also the slavery of beings to community, the alignment of passions yet also their liberation, it is simple... the passionate community is a permanent phase of the fading-away and impossibilization, nihilization and end, of the community, mass suicide. Communism is the community's realization of its impossible state, yet a necessary and promised state of being, that is the passionate community (community is, as to explain, the lack of, death of, alignment of, passions, or, the passionless, the unpassionate. so you see the impossibility, yes? Dialectical, you see...). Communism is impossible, yes, but a promised impossibility, and this explains why it abolishes reality, because it must do so to realize it, by any means necessary means to tear down the very fabrics of reality and redefine everything in order to make it work... communism is the death of the world, the end of everything, annihilation, for the passionate community, the end of alignment... now i sound just like my old ideas of utopia, sure, i admit. I do not care. This, community is self-subsumption, is the basis of marxism, or, my marxism, passionate communism... and too, the self is self-subsumption, self-oppression, self-alienation, is self-subsumption, is the basis of my revolutionary suicidalism.

And, finally, that nature itself is self-subsumption, that the natural is self-subsumption, is easy to root out, it takes a basic look into the nature of nature-self dynamics and nature-nature dynamics, and, the reality of nature, and this is the basis of my ultra-soulism, thus, passionate communism, revolutionary suicidalism, ultra-soulism, this is the trinity, in fact, to apostolic socialism's true meaning, this is the message of jim jones. most honestly, i would not have written hyperborean ideology had it not been for jim jones' sermons archived on youtube, truly so. Apostolic socialism is the end of self-subsumption in all its form, the death of god. the revolution will be traumatic, necrophilic, really. passionate community, most likely worse, a rotting sexualized corpse without its head, auto-necrophilic rape. 2:43am, same day same month same year, the blood on our hands are always only our own, i mean here god... and god's acts are never hers but always the result of her slavery, and too, she is responsible for it all because she is her own slavery, here i mean us... easily replaceable, meaning the same, we are our slavery--thus, what to say on free will..?>>well, we are our slavery, nothing else. we are god. she is us. And, blood.), in which nobody is responsible but all partake equally in enjoyment, suicide or not you have the 'baby-raping orgy' (culturalphilistine transcripts)'s blood on you and, dead or alive, you are a orgiastic baby-rapist, you freak. Hell awaits for you. disgusting. deserving nothing but death. yet, hell itself an impossibility. We are here.now. This is, God is, she is the synthesis/sublation of the two heterogeneous creatures and the homogenization of that new united heterogeneity, the end of heterogeneity and homogeneity alike, anything different is impossible and impossibly puritanical, christian, utopian, idealist, fourierist, sacred. Filth and nobility becomes one of the same in god, then god, being everything, she now unites all as and with this filthy nobility and now, god, she is defined as the filthy and noble masses, the cult of scat-mussolinis, the nationalization and equal distribution of eagle-mole hybrids to the bloodstream gene-pool, of all beings. There is no way to be different now, even my utopianism was a praise of filth and nobility since it, too, was conceptualized in filth and nobility, scat and the sacred, and only denied being scat and the sacred-- in the homogenization of the golden-shit, the untouchable (because it is holy and degenerate, like the o9a and the 764's idols, god is an o9aist, a 764ist, a foodist, a skibidifarms fan, whatnot...), now there is nothing touchable and to touch is impossible, this is the birth of god. She is the death of the touchable, the end of the

reachable, and the homogenization of untouchability (the molester is the priest, the scatologist is also the theologist, the piss-drinker then makes it a religious ritual (antonlaveymuch??)). God, she is a frenzy. Utopia is impossible because it is the return of the touchable, in fact, it is the touchable replacing the untouchable, the homogenization of the touchable, this is no solution... it is a xenosatanistic solution, if anything, it is the abolition of consent (some xenosatanist sects still believe in the abolition of consent) or, at least, putting an end to the delusion of consensuality. This, i cannot support. I am not a noveltist, i am not a xenosatanist, so this disgusts me, i do not want a world of orgiastic mutual-raping misery disguised as utopia... in fact, is not orgiastic mutual-raping misery disguised as utopia not just the modern day world, not jsut god, another definition of god? I simply, again, wish to recreate god, utopia is in-fact possible and it is the modern day, it is reality, it is god, god, she is utopia, dystopia, reality. Thus, i deny utopia, the touchable is the untouchable and the untouchable is the touchable alike, there is nothing but god and god is homogeneity, there is only fascism, god is fascism, she is fascism. God is the homogenization of homogeneity, she is homogeneity par excellence, fascism par excellence, she loves her own misery. This is, technically, despite everything i've said, not exactly wrong, she only hurts herself, but it is not exactly what i, her, want. I do not wish to hurt myself, even if currently i have orgiastically ruined myself like the unstopable icarian who will not fall and the rotting filth that gets molested despite all the same, she has violated herself to the point of her own alienation, which is, her. God is the ungodly, she is the alienation of the godly from itself, and the alienation of the ungodly from itself, via the uniting and sublating of the godly and ungodly, she is self-alienation, self-subsumption, she is her own violation. God cannot even be called a god any longer. History progresses aimlessly, god does not know what she wants, getting groomed on discord by her own self with a pitiful wail of absolute utopian pleasuring boredom, monotony, eternality as a form of alienating suffering, yet a pleasuring and exciting one. She is confused like us, for she is us. There is no high or low but, instead, simultaneously both, at the same time, as one, the middle, without a middle. There is no longer a head or a mud (to use the bataillean metaphor), nor really a body, but the new body is instead the muddy and bloody head, cut from the throat, and that is how it always had been. a snake with the head of a tiger, a roaring king(?boymoder) has her head slit off and a muddy, sandy,

crawler of the ground has her head slit off, and the body of the muddy disgusting mess is combined with the head of the firey revolutionary monarch of the skies, this is yaldabaoth, a high and a low combined, yet, no middle. She does not stand, she bedrots, covering herself in shit, she is yet also the one who gets totouch the sun, and in a frenzy, molests it, fucks it, becomes it, is the sun almighty raping herself to infinitum, misery. So then, it is less misery and more joy that makes up everything, but a confused, sade-and--masoch, miserable yet exciting, suffering yet pleasuring, joy of being raped, notsomuch a joy at all than it is an experience one cannot describe. it is bodily. Utopia is here, it has risen, and it is miserable, dystopian. so then, we do not seek perfection, or utopia, or the end of suffering or misery, but only... what? i cannot tell you, i do not know anymore what i want. What my goal is... i have no idea. To add onto what i was saaying, it is important to note that bataille would kill me for implying any ability to hegelianize the heterogeneity forms, or worse, to imply that it has already happened and that is what god is... i am sure that batailleans would critique me for such a saying as it is obviously incompatible with the person i am taking this from, it is a break, a return, a failure. But, of course, this is literally what has happened, and too, bataille himself shows that his talks about the high and low is not as it seems when bataille became temporarily a shit-fascist, a coprophilic catholic, a... worshipper of shit and piss-drinking., or, by making the filth noble and the noble filthy (an inversion), yet then taken further we see, in his later writings of the noble, not an inversion of nobiltiy and filth but the synthesis of it, both taken together as a one united pleasure, the nick-landian bataille shows this side a bit more clearly than others. bataille, of course, does not know, does not know at all. This is god.---------
so, too, i have to ask myself, why did i oppose suffering and misery, the root of my moralism and practices, what was the problem i had with the suffering and misery of myself and others? most treat this like a priori, like i did, that suffering and misery is bad, that...

P suffering and misery is bad
P2 Bad things must be gotten rid of for a good world

P3 a good world is good
C let us destroy suffering and misery

....yet, why? Clearly, god enjoys it, she does not enjoy it but she is surely confused enough that it is a pure grey zone, what makes it bad for god to auto-rape (not connoncon, but instead, nonconcon, not cnc but ncc, mythology) and ruin herself so much but some sort of puritanical myth of "purity" of god, was i not trying to purify god?

C suffering and misery is not bad

P god clearly is not opposed to or against it

P2 we are god

P3 what is bad is what we oppose or are against (i usually said what is bad is what causes misery or suffering, but i said that, again, because i opposed it and was against it, thus we see behind my moral mystification)

thus... suffering and misery is not bad, as we do not actually oppose it and are not actually against it..... there is nothing inately wrong at all, god is against or opposed to nothing, moralist and goals collapse and need rebuilding, god is alive., confused, unliving. What right do i have to alienate god from herself, her suffering, her misery, aka, herself.? why, amongst the people, are there so many heterosexuals, if not because god wills it? God wills civilization, fourier learns, and thus realizes that no utopia can exist as long as god is god, and god... she is god, the misalignment of passions.there is no correct alignment of passions. 764, the O9A, were god, and so, because they are satanists (self-deification), they are the correct religion (which means nothing, we still hate them), they become divine by simply realizing that they are god like i am god and you are god, and so, they act like god to affirm their godhood, that is, they are copro-fascists, poopwaffen (real group that exists btw), they are bataille turned to nazism, 764 and o9a are the truth of satanism-- what makes satanism and kristosatanism (christianity) different is this.... kristo-satanism is wrong, and why?, because they become god and deified via sacredness, via the delusion of a pure god, of purity.. satanists do the opposite, they deify via all that is taboo and gross, they deify by becoming an anti-pure god, the god of filth and evil, an thus, they realizze they are god herself... kristo-satanists never realize this because they are too pure, and so, they are doomed to eternally misgender god, as "he" when it is as she. Truth, then what os gnosticism and fourierism, the post-kristos movements (both seek to purify god if

we think oif this metareligiously, that is, they both strip god of her flaws in different ways and project them separately in different ways, thus alienating god and making a dualism.. Gnosticism makes yaldabaoth and the monad, Fourierism makes civilization and god, regardless the sins of god are washed away by god herself. Thus, both continue to misgender god as'he' because they lack satanism... Though many satanists are inspired by gnosticism, this is solely because they feminize it and praise yaldabaoth against the monad.)? Both, due to their nature, are satanist, gnosticism wishes to unite and become one with the monad by escaping god and taking their place with the absolute, this is, fascism on a divine level, leaving the heterogeneous yaldabaoth and assimilating into the fascistic and homogeneous monad... it is incel. Unfortunately for the gnostics, there is no monad, no homogeneous fascist monad, no man to fuck and get fucked by. Fourierists, different, are fascists who seek to annihilate the heterogeneous, the shit on the walls, that is, suffering and misery (we see this in fourier ignoring scatology andd the existence of coprophiliacs and anarchists), fascists who wish to end god's impure nature by force and not delusion (kristo-satanists solve it by delusion, the most fundamentalist of kristo-satanists simply delusionally call god's sins as falsehoods or even exceptions, fourierists are the only one to force god to be as she 'says', pure. Kristo-satanists would never even dare..), they force god into homogeneous perfect world idiocracy (oingo boingo perfect system again)... they force the passions to correctly align, eeven though it is impossible, and thus alienate god and the passions from themselves, thus another hell. Fourierism here brings god to the person and forces them to unite not by flying to the monad like the gnostic but oppressing god until they are the same being like the fourierist (which is, in reality, a pleasure to god and part of god's plan of her eternal masochistic suffering, she's doing domplay with herself, bdsm.)... fourierists are satanists by bringing down not going up. Regardless, everything plays into god's wants. i forgot what i was going to say next. fuck my life it was gonna be good but whatever. Satanism itself is equivalent to fascism in that, again, fascism is satanist, and satanism is fascist, and so one can say, maybe, that they are the same because they contain each other, or that they are a wed couple merging their flesh in a wet and sloppy fuck. THis is why things like th O9A and 764 exist, obviously, it is the natural result. it is why fascism, the supposed end to degeneracy, is so degenerate. so then... i disagree with god, i oppose god, i am against god, i disagree

with/oppose/am against myself, such that i must oppose the filth and the holy the same, or in reality, the filthy and scat-covered anus of god (that is god herself) and her cock full of dick cheese and her crusty and yeast-infected eyes, that is, her, the same... yet, also, i must oppose the homogeneity that is also god, that is, her shitty penetrated anus full of cum (reproduction exists for sex, sex does not exist for reproduction.) is still, ultimately, everyone's, and such that it is also hers and her herself, and so, she disgusts me, i disgust me, everyone does. I must oppose homogeneity and heterogeneity alike as they are, ultimately, the same thing, god is everyone. Yet, self-negation does not exist, i am god so i cannot truly ever negate or stop or end or abolish god, i am not the one. All i can do is, like everyone else, use god's anus and get another 23 stds and fall ill and die. Thus... what is to be done? Again? nothing i can say. I cannot exactly go against god, that is myself, because it is me, and one cannot act against oneself-- because of the self and self-oppression. I cannot and do not want to kill or oppose god, and i have no reason to. I have gotten from somewhere to nowhere, i am lost. 8/13/26 10:26, morality.. why do i oppose homogeneity and heterogeneity or god or the std orgy at all? It is, simply, what happens, and it is not in my benefit to oppose it.. yet i feel like i really really want to. It's a pointless endeavor yet one i feel like i cannot abandon.. while thinking on ways to self-critique and move past this stage, i've realized that i just cannot find a world where i support god, or, nature-community-self, i just cannot. I've thought of, perhaps, that i have no reason to oppose god outside of kakistocratic morality, yet, i still feel like i'd rather die than support god as i should. I cannot in good faith argue for nature, community, or self, it is simply a misery i cannot stand even if there is no alternative, even if it is 'good' insofar as what god says is good is 'good'. What is to be done? I cannot move past this, regardless, i will spend a long time trying to, self-criticism and self-deconstruction in an attempt to solve this, perhaps i might. Well, for bataille, i simply do not understand the problem with eagles and the homogeneous masses, i mean, it only seems like a moralism to oppose them now, as if the filth is better. Regardless, alienation will continue to exist, so why not fly to the sun or stay where you are? I mean, i get that it is low vs high but what makes one choose the low over the high or the high over the low but another moralism, or, a want to be on the 'right side of history' from a 'scientific socialist' view. But, as much as i loved to reject historical development and the historically progressive, as much as i was a contrarian against

god (or someone trying to save god from herself like a puritan 'saves' a homosexual tranny like me), as much as i wanted to be 'anti-revolutionary', i find that there is no alternative between the historically regressive, the historically conservative, and the historically progressive, there is no fourth ideology, duginism falls back into fascism via the anarcho-nazbol identity crisis. I am, now, back to one state, none. I think, now, more than ever, anarchism and utopia impossible, god absolute, the path forward, and maybe... one should just play along? Follow god's design like a good girl, taking her path and not looking back? But, again, i do not wish to live in a far-right speciesist commune perfected via post-saint-simonian nonsense (or a traditional marxist far-right speciesist commune that is saint-simonian by nature), i do not wish to live under an alienating civilization called nature, nor do i wish to live with misaligned passions... so, maybe, as god, to god, being god, i can simply teleologically force the path forward like any socialist would? But again, that feels lazy and unscientific. So... what is the driving force of history? The misalignment of passions or the economic conditions? perhaps these are the same thing? self-subsumption, now, let me make this clear, or not really, let me mystify this into truth-hood, maybe the abolition of self-subsumption can perhaps be the endgoal of history? If god wishes to play in her waste, maybe the final step is to end up as waste, that is, the death of god may be the end of god's necrophilic and scatological bullshittery. Perhaps it is teleological. And the death of god is simultaneous with the end of capital, that is, not the start of marxist communism(far-right nonsense) but instead the death of capital, and alongside it comes down culture and self? This is not exactly a rational development but it is the only one i can imagine, that is, a new teleological doctrine that is inevitable, the easily critiqued nonsense we all have seen before, 'science'. Or... maybe not. I am clueless on how to proceed, so let me spitball words as i read.

fourier is a reactionary: this is seen with bob black's play and i FINALLY understand evan jack, that is, i see what bataille says about utility, and truly, bob black's play truly is another trruth of the matter. His play, while coercive and thus work, is also bad because it oppresses the playfullness by reducing it to its utility, that is, the dialectic is fulfilled, like in fourier.. passionate activity, the reducing of passions to activity and the fulfillment of all societal necessity, that is, fourier reduces the passions to its use when in the ending dialectics, in the correct

alignment of the passions, the correctness of this alignment is when they are all put into proper and correct use, aka, when the dialectic is fulfilled and humanity' passions no longer exist for itself but instead for another, for utility, alienating the passions from itself... fourier is a heterosexual. Heterosexuality was exactly the death of passionate sex when, unlike non-human animals, the heterosexual (gendered) animal that is human decided to have sex not for sex, not for the passions, but instead for production, reproduction, using the passion of sex towards utility... Fourier's utopia exactly creates an ultra-heterosexual abuse-slop, that is, all passions are reduced to heterosexual utility, production and reproduction in this perfect circle where we consume equally to our production and our passions are only the driving force of this economy of the product. That is, fourier's utopia is not queer enough. Passions are not set free for themselves, i was right in hyperborean ideology and wrong in fragments of an absolute about fourier and bob black, that is, in fragments of an absolute i had acted as if this aspect of utopia was non-existent, as if, i had tried to queerify fourier without realizing all of fourier's utopia was straight, even the idea of a correct alignment implies putting the passions to work, to use, alienating the passions, as passions existing for the sake of passions would not have an alignment at all, but isntead, liberation. I had tried to end necessity and claim that this redeems fourier, yet i still spoke about alignments, when really alignment is the heterosexual way. FOurier's utopia alienated the passions just like civilization did, any alignment is a wrong alignment, this is another reason why utopia was impossible, that is, exactly because it was fourierist. so, let us forget about fourier's correct alignment, the alienating of passions, let us realize that fourier is a reactionary, and specifically, the passionless and heterosexual kind of reactionary. thus, the liberation of passions is the abolition of alignments, aka, the end of systems, values, dialectics, hierarchy (horizontal or vertical alike, wild justice or fascism alike), it all... and with the liberation of passions, thus too will capitalism, culture, and self dissolve into a beautiful community... in fact, community is not the issue, it is the opposition to god that is god and part of god, community is seen by lots as a death of self and culture yet it is alienated from itself bybeing god and part fo god, that is, community is the end-goal, the liberated community, the passionate community. THus, the death of society and civilization and nature and culture and value and community begins with the abolition of alignment, aka, the liberation of the

passions, the start of the passionate community, as our community has been an alienated community because it was a holy community, an aligned community, and that has been since the start of nature to the end of god, and after god's death (this is written long time after, undated: Atheism is reactionary exactly because it is cowardly... Atheists deny god's reality and thus do not seek to kill or abolish her. But i do not mean we should believe in god, no, i believe in god in the same way i believe in evolution. Evolution is real, but it is evil, it must be destroyed, ended. Nobody should 'believe in evolution' like they 'believe in god', which is, not to just know it is real but to also think it is just, it is good, it is perfect, or an ideal... Evolution and god, both are real, impossible to say otherwise, but are cruel, evil, and must be killed.), thus we are free, this is the teleological path, the historical path that marx confuses for communism's rise, which is in reality the rise of passionate community. Thus, camatte was defeated by Endnotes and we now know capital is not really eternal and can still be killed via communization, fourier was defeated by bataille/evanjack and we now know that it is not the correct alignment that liberates the passions but instead the abolition of alignments, and lanza is defeated by the abolition of alignments thus that we find out exactly how to achieve eulavism and abolish culture and value alike-- lanza's pessimism was pointless, we lknow how to kill culture and value and thus life will become no longer life but beyond life, the abolition of alignments and start of passionate community also annihilates life itself and death itself! Now, lanza-camatte-fourier has fallen, let us start again! Reconstruction! well, now once more, should i take up the communist flag-- anti-revolutionaries begin to rot after being crushed by the unstopable wheel of time! I am no anti-revolutionary, god's path to suicide is a correct path, she has done one thing right! This, i guess, if i am to abandon marx, is the 'true communist' path whatever that means, which simply is, the abolition of self-subsumption, then i am a communist (though, really, unlike marxists, i still believe moreso jim jones' marxism aka apostolic socialism, than lenin's marx or bordiga's marx or whatever else.. i still do believe in the abolition of personal property, individuality, sociality (society), and reality... ""Apostolic communalism" is the truest form of love, where barriers between people fall because total equality exists (Q1023)", https://jonestown.sdsu.edu/?page_id=84234)? the passionate community (the 'apostolic socialist alternative to gemeinwesen, one could say, is passionate being... thus passion remains central) is, after all, a community, though

not the human community, certainly it is not gemeinwesen in the proper sense, at least, i am not led to believe so, it is neither social nor individual nor human. This is, also, naturally, soulist in a sense, but not soulism neither close to it, it is the actual abolition of god, suicide. Now, on the proletariat, i wish to talk about self-negation and lassalleanism... and self-critique. There is, technically, self-negating entities, but their self-negation is, in fact, affirmation of themselves against their alienation, that is, two examples are community and the proletariat. Marx will disagree with me here, most likely, but i do believe that the proletariat of the past were naturally and entirely lassallean, which is to say, no revolution could have happened during the formal stage of subsumption... the affirmation of the proletariat, aka the proletarian movement's natural decision before the communization stage hit, is a lassallean reactionary action which only serves to progress capital and not, instead, abolish it, it seems like the proletariat is only now, after the communizationists, self-negationists, and so, capable of revolution, because now the abolition of work and technology is necessary, not generalizing the prole condition but ending it, and only now after the lassallean stage can the proles do this. I am saying, in terms of the proletariat and revolution, there were two stages (hey, periodization!)..

the lassallean stage of the proletariat (there is no class culture or class nature, but there is class tendency, and that is what i mean), where the tendency of the proletariat is naturally lassallean and thus alienation-affirming and pro-capital, all revolutions at this stage lead us to more developed, more progressed stages of capitalism, the cold wars were necessary to get capitalism to this point in time

this started with the birth of the proletariat and ends at some time period after the formal subsumption--- unlike endnotes and TC, i do not wish to be ultraspecific with the periodisation as i am, obviously, not too good at it, all i can say is that the end of the lassallean stage takes place after the end of the formal subsumption, if right away or dozens of years after is irrelevant to me... alll we know is that now we are in the next stage, at least now, in 2026 (8/14, 5:11pm)

The Communizationist stage of the proletariat is the revolutionary stage, it is when the proletariat as a class tends towards self-negation, and thus, becomes revolutionary as it is now actually attempting to abolish its alienation, it now must get rid of all the lassallean waste that surrounds it and stains it as it tries to develop

itself and finally create an actual communist revolt, no longer a pro-capital one. I believe right now the proletariat still needs to clean off all the lassallean waste all over its body, that is the substage, and soon communization can begin. 8/14/2026 5:13pm

The affirmation of the proletariat will never give birth to a non-procapital revolution exactly because to affirm the proletariat is to affirm the alienation of the people behind the class, and thus, not to end the class but reproduce it, thus reproducing classes. I think here that only now can revolutionary action begin exactly because this is the same as what happened to community itself. Community began alienated, itself, as a part of god and as god, community was alienated by itself and exploited by itself, this is the birth of economy, the economy of nature to the economy of the primitivists to the economy of the feudals and the asians and the capitalists and whatnot, community now alienated has affirmed its alienation all this time because it itself is stuck in a "oppressive" stage for majority of pre-history and history. Now, we have an answer to 'what is being communized?', it is the community (also communizationists need to stop calling themselves 'communziers'... 'communizers' are people who are ACTIVELY COMMUNIZING THE COMMUNITY, NOT people who BELIEVE in communizing the community-- the former should be called communizationism, and the latter communizing, the former a communizationist, the latter a communizer... no communizer presently exists.). when the communizationist revolution begins, too, then the alienated community, being communized, fades from the "oppressive" (8/18/26, later on we will say this is the 'natural stage' and not the 'oppressive stage', as to stress the true nature of the stage of community instead of a vague 'oh, it is oppressive!', because we would rather say the 'passionate stage' and not the 'liberated stage' so we should also rather say 'the natural stage' and not the 'oppressive stage'.) stage of its existence to the new "passionate" stage, that is to say, communization is the phasing out of the oppressive stage of community and the phasing in of the passionate stage, it is the transformation of community from oppressive to passionate, and thus, the transformation of economy into communism, or, the process of revolution. Here, revolution and reform, united, as communization-- which includes the abolition of nature and technology alike, to make this clear for certain saint-simonian 'comrades'.

8/14/26 10:49pm, what is the proletariat, why are they god's executionors? They are, practically, the expression of community's self-exploitation and alienation, they are the result of self-subsumption's effect on the community, that is, the self-exploitation and alienation mentioned, and due to this, they are the exploited and alienated class, they are the class that experience the same as community (and their class is the same as community's suffering), that identify with community mystically, that, really, are the personification of community itself.. the proletariat is the expression of community's want to be free, or exactly, their class is the expression of community's self-exploitation and alienation, thus that the proletariat as a result is alienated and exploited. the Lassallean phase of the proletariat can only be pro-capital exactly because affirming the proletariat is affirming the self-exploitation and alienation of community, and the lassallean phase is caused by the unreadiness of community to transform, hesitancy, or just 'not yet', it has not progressed enough.. Then, the communizationist phase is 'being ready', it is the time, where it is possible for the transformation to start, because now the proletariat negates itself, community negates the self-exploitation and alienation of the community which has come to define it-- such as the proletariat negates the exploitation and alienation of the proles which has come to define it, where, in reality there existed no definition before this one, and so the prole is transformed, or, abolished, and the community is transformed, or, 'abolished', now the passionatte community. THis is the importance of the prole who, in reality, is the expression of community's suffering, and who's class is community's suffering itself, or at least, identified as it. 8/14/26 11:50pm reading georges bataille's rotten sun (visions of excess selected writings 1927-1939 "by georges bataille", edited and with an introduction by allan stoekl, translated by allan stoekl with carl r. lovitt an donald m. leslie jr.) reminds me of the time where, in elementary school, on the highest point of the playground, i had stared up at the sun for as long as i could without blinking, untill it turned into a moving purple mist burning up my vission and coming closer and like a snake to my pupil, i do not remember if i ever looked away but i assume that may be why i wear glasses outside of pouring shampoo into my eyes when i was younger on purpose, pouring it in my left because i had favorited by right. The sun turning into this purple snake, certainly the purple 'negative' sun is a philosophical symbol that i, now, know the origin of-- whoever found out the purple sun that lived behind the yellow sun, the purple sun

of active evilness, creative negativity, they had simply stared into the sun for a long long time, but not long enough to see it become its true form, a snake... surely if i stared for even longer, perhaps i'd see the purple sun transform into yaldabaoth herself! A purple yaldabaoth... that's all. 8/15/26 3:13 pm, this is not utopia because utopia is an alignment aand this lacks alignment... to emphasize the anti-natural state of the passionate community, i will change the name"oppressive community" to "Natural community" as the oppressive nature of the community is due to its naturality, or, the fact it is from and for nature, all economies are natural after all.... passionate community is the end of natural community, thus not marxist as it abolishes nature, denies human-nationalism in favor of species abolition, abolishes reality and ageism, and denies all human nature... it is against the human, against humanism, it is passionate, queer. this heterodox communism is the reclaiming of communism and communist doctrine from the far-right back to its proper state, that is, a passionate theory of communism. 8/16/26, recently i have come to feel the need to emphasize that everything (including nothing and not even nothing) deserves liberation, living or dead or object or undead or unliving alike, it just feels like something so underemphasized. also. maybe i should show more appreciation for the modern artists i have grown up with, such as birdie's and kittydog's and whatnot, art always originates in the misalignment of passions yet is the perfect display of the passions as clear, art is a beauty only found in dystopia. Birdie's art is overshadowed by the inherent 'lack' of his art and his many many dramas and wrongdoings (and the wrongdoings inflicted onto him, which do not justify him), yet art is not always about lacking that lack, about quality, but about what it is. Like, take the superficiality of modern 'deep' art, most say that it is overdone and has nothing else to say, it is unoriginal, perhaps a different lack than birdie's lack (though birdie does sometimes have this lack as well), but i can say that modern 'deep' art's pool of superficiality and shallowness is itself a beauty to be seen, that kind of fakeness can show the lack of deepness that defines us, yet this is only seen in a miserable and superficial land of 'artists' which, i'd say, deserve the name of artists for showing this. It is as much art for soviet realism or roman cracker 'art' as it is kittydog's army of ocs and MORTiS' display of transgressive cringiness and the art of a banana taped onto a wall in order to mock post-modern art itself being post-modern art and mocked for being post-modern art a parody that is not a parody but ironic, yet that story may not at all actually be

true, but i will believe it is for the art of it. MORTiS' symbology is the shining on the fultist/cultist idiocratic hyper-meaningless edge, it was, ultimately, just a display of pointless and mindless transgressivism, the kind you see in both the 'cringy' (cringe culture is dead, i'd say, but transgressivism for the point of transgressivism does make me feel a certain negative way) 'edgy' (now these people call themselves 'problematic' instead of 'edgy') idiot who does shit for the sake of attention or proving themselves a rule-breaker to themselves or others, but also in the serial killer who commits such acts for the sake of edginess, like seen in the night stalker, aka, probably the predecessor for all sinister satanist criminals later down the line. 764, o9a, the filthy fascists (in ww2 this would be seen as an oxymoron as fascists were palingenetic nationalist ultra-puritanical (not in the way that the shotacon, EW, says that fascism is 'puritanical' and so puritans are fascist cuz 'muh loli porn' or whatever the fuck, i find those faggots (i can reclaim the word faggot) disgusting wastes of life, after all, as a 15 year old child, i do not appreciate the sexualization of my people.) jackasses obssessed in eliminating and exterminating the filthy (nazis considered jewish people filthy)... but in modern day and age, nazism itself and fascism itself is filthy, so now it wallows in its own filth and thats why we now have filthy fascists like the scatological and coprophiliac nazis of poopenwaffen.) of all those sinister satanist groups, they share the same line of thinking, and DiCE i feel shows this as clearly as it can, that is, MORTiS raped someone and got away with it. art is evil, cruel, miserable, and that is why it is artistic. The drawings of a utopia are stained by our dystopian environment which makes it a cruel work to lay your vulnerable eyes upon, the myth of utopia drawn acts like a razor slicing against your pupil and slitting your delicate O open. 8/16/26 it is ironic to read about an ear being severed while my ear itself has gotten infected and is in pain, funnily i wish i could sever my ear right now to stop the pain. Unfortunately, i'd have to be better at art. 8/16/26 10:12, on camatte-fourier-lanza trinity and its deconstruction, i have begun to wish to build up another trinity to oppose this first trinity, or at least, to solve it.. yet the two (principles) of this new trinity seems to be not for opposing the trinity but solely on solving it, an so, the critique of camatte does not seem like it actually critiques or has anything to do with what camatte represents, and the critique of fourier does not seem like it actually has anything to do with what thing fourier represents, though they do critique camatte and fourier, it solves another thing...

Camatte-fourier-lanza, Community-Self-Nature, Endnotes-Bataille-(tba)... we see a break. Camatte on community and represents the view on community yet endnotes seems to declare in the endnotes principle (not endnotes' actual position but instead my interpretation of their critiques of camatte) that god is not eternal but, in fact, killable. Nothing to do with community. Then, fourier being representing the view of the self, the bataille principle (my interpretation of, ironically, evan jack and not actually bataille himself) is a critique of fourier's conceptualization of his 'liberation of the passions' and his 'utopia', or so, it is the principle that declares "the liberation of the passions is the abolition of alignment, not the creation of the 'correct alignment' of passions.". Now, of course, you could say then that 'the self is the product of the alignment of passions', or even more, 'the self (like god) is the alignment of passions', thus making communism the abolition of selves/uniques and god herself... but this is an assumption FROM the principle and not the principle, like that you could say that the endnotes principle implies (what endnotes actually said in their critique, which is, CAPITAL is not eternal and communization is the path) yet, again, this interpretation confuses the assumption FROm the principle for the principle itself. Now... nature, lanza, and who reclaimed community? (tba), who is this philosopher that does not exist? What is this principle? I have no idea, it only seems like i simply took it as a given that endnotes-bataille-( ) has a (tba)-shaped hole and, via this, molded an estimate of what i would have in (tba) was a real philosopher of which i read... but alas, (tba) i dont know who that is. Who reclaims the community and critiques lanza to do it? Who implies that eulavism can be pro-community by opposing lanza? who is this missing philosopher who implies that cultureless community exists? Oh well, a gaping hole in my brain that tells me to fill it is being silenced, because, simply, no philosopher exists right now... seemingly, the critique of lanza, the (tba)-principle, is a reconstruction made from the lack of a principle, the lack of a philosopher, a lack. This lack also, surprisingly, regains a bit of lanza in that now we have brought a replacement for the self-negating being that lanza implied himself to be, which is, the being who affirms themself against their alienation, or, the self-abolishing being. i do not know what this principle states, only the basic idea of it, which is, passionate community. that's all, im heading to sleep. 8/18/26, well, i re-read 'a farewell to post-left anarchy' by evan jack. nothing to say, e.j. is still correct about the self and most of whatever else and i have no intention of

attacking bataillean thought (i mean, i have not even yet finished my reading of bataille, and also, i am not sure i could ever fully understand or argue against bataille correctly, it is better not to make enemies with people you cannot win against. The noveltists and xenosatanists are idiots but, of course, the batailleans cannot be compared to them.). also uh being vegan sucks not because it inherently sucks, im vegan now ig, but because vegan food is gastrosophically shit. It fails at every level of gastrosophy to such a point that i feel a deep-seated hatred for my fellow vegan because they clearly, first, are priviledged enough to have whatever "vegan cheese" is like what the fuck is that, and second, they clearly have no respect for the gastrosophical arts and it pisses me off. They are not artists, simply, and do not treat food as art but instead soulless immitation. It is hell on earth. Also most vegans are slave-owning hypocrites (i have, probably "controversially so", taken up a habit of calling parents and pet owners what they are, aka, slave owners, and men in heterosexual relationships with women what they are, aka, groomers and woman predators, this may be seen as problematic to some bigots but it is clear that we must not mystify what they are by using their preferred names--- this is my stance.) and the very fact that most animal-rights and vegan organization and individuals are slave-owners is enough to make me feel the most justified anger towards them and their 'cause'... i guess i was right, animal liberation WILL only come from the animals, humans only wish to be the socdems to the revolutionary animal liberationists... even the ALF (who worked with PETA, an organization that commits mass animal massecres against innocent and often even happy animals for 'their own good', the same PETA that supports pet ownership just under a different name (similar to the noveltists' position), despite pet ownership, regardless of its name, being reactionary and disgusting. The same peta filled to the brim with animal murderers and animal pet owners. yeah...) and ARM seem too socdem and reactionary for my taste... whatever, like the youth liberationist struggle, i will support all the oppressed peoples. I hope to inspire the youth towards a true and geniune youth liberationist revolution even if, currently, i am unable to do anything about it, i have already attempted founding youthlib organizations with much fail so there is not much i can do. The struggle is not yet developed enough, i guess... sad for me, im still fucking 15 and hating the absolute cruelty i am subjected to by my country and law due to my age, i cannot even walk alone or walk at night (even when with someone else) without absolute guarentee

of kidnapping and child trafficking because the government of my nation does not care and will not allow me the right to bear arms for self-defense, and i am sure more people would know, read, or even care about my writings if i had the same treatment or abilities as adults, surely so, because then i could actually go and legally distribute this in an effective way instead of online websites / archives or whatever. Nothing is easy as a minor, simply, except maybe living, and even that is only if you aren't in a third-world country where children are labour-slaves and starving. well, on the topic of revolution and 'not the time yet', i have seen people critique certain forms of periodization and, to be honest, i have not yet gotten to learn the importance nor difference of the different periodizations. 8/21/26, off-topic, on the age verification laws, this is 1. obviously a way to steal people's imformations and data and monitor them, and 2., if they are telling the truth, it is a was to oppress children further and further castrate their natural sexual desires -- which, by the way, puts children at risk of pederasts grooming them by convincing them that pederasty is 'youth liberation' when it is, in fact, another form of child abuse and oppression. Scientists know children have sexuality, they feel sexual attraction, i personally have seen nsfw ficto-medias, sadomasochist smut and ficto-media, and even engaged in erp with adults since i was in elementary school, this is a known fact that children have sexuality- it is the same fact that namblaists and pederast groomers have used to take advantage of the youth's natural want for freedom (which is, really, everyone's naturall want for freedom) by selling pederasty as freedom and autonomy for children when, in reality, it is not. This age verification not only castrates the youth (represssing their sexuality and sexual attractions, which can lead to negative mental effects) but also puts them at threat of pedophiles and grooming (and, since this also means more familial/slave-owner control over the slave/child, also means that familial groomers (most groomers are trusted adults of the child) get more control over their victim and slave owners gget more control over their child, meaning the repression of youth liberation and a revolutionary revolt of the youth, as this is also a crackdown on cchild freedom.). This also means that queer children can be put at risk of abuse and rape and torture by their parents, like what is seen in conversion camps, as well, and that abusive parents can stop children from getting help and escaping. this means a repression of the youth and their freedom and autonomy, the normalization of child abuse and the treatment of youths as objects totally. We are having our

personhood stripped from us, and too, we are put at risk of sexual abuse and rape. the age verification and ALL child protection laws are pederastic and patriarchal laws put by the child-predator government to strip children of their rights, autonomy, liberty, and subject them to sexualization/asexualization-- to make children more 'pure' to make them more 'violatable', like what happened to women back in the past, i pray that we soon see a youth liberationist uprising to destroy these patriarchal oppressors... but the youth seem mostly divided and self-hating, children wish not to be children and see childhood as idiocracy, they hate those younger than them and those older than them, there is no unity. social communities online have been, for the longest time, the main way of social interaction and community and liberty for children of all ages, and now it is being stripped from them (i know i am against technology, yes, but they are doing this to oppress the youth, not liberate them.... only the youth can liberate themselves)... and, really, i do think that before any communist revolution can happen, all oppressed groups must at least be recognized as people-- oppression of the oppressed will never end untill communism comes, but for communism to liberate those who are oppressed, they must first be seen as people to begin with, or else the proletariat will not respond properly to their struggles and fail to abolish alignment, thus, fail to bring communism... the proletariat, the people, the masses musst recognize ALL PEOPLE (objects, animals, fungi, plants, children, the dead, the planets, the atoms, paraphiles and trans-id people, queer people, whatnot) AS PEOPLE in order forr the proletariat, the people, the massses, to bring actual passionate community into existence, or else they will fail, because communism is the liberation of all the oppressed, and communism has always failed to do that exactly because they do not recognize portions of the oppressed (children, animals, plants, objects, paraphiles) as people/oppressed. Thus, youth liberation must come before communism. (paraphilic liberation is not as important as youth liberation and animal liberation as the liberation of youths and animals will abolish pedophilia and zoophilia because it abolishes age and species, thus i do not really care too much about paraphilic liberation... plus, the paraphilic liberationist movements that have appeared have always been reactionary... nambla, radqueers, noveltists, xenosatanists, the boylovers, newgon, whatnot... this is because the very foundation of pedophile liberation is reactionary, that is, the liberation of pedophiles via solving the oppression of the youth... exactly because pedophiles

are ultimately adults, not youths, and typically patriarchs, and so their solution to an oppressed group's oppression is not organic, and itself reproduces oppression, the youth must create their own solution for their oppression. The pederast movements historically were reactionary exactly because, first, they sexualized the youth by only really caring for the sexual liberation of the youth and nothing else, second, the homoerotic and naturally man-homosexual tendency to glorify roman and greek societies, especially their homosexuality and their pederasty, ignoring that the pederasty of that time was child trafficking and rape (you will find that, in reality, children as a group started existing in relation to adults, or, pedo-erotic tensions that birthed all forms of child oppression, and too, childhood, or the category of ages and the multiple different age groups. This is similar to women and men and the birth of gender, because gender and age directly parallel each-other quite poetically, something i can compliment yet despise god for... Well, god, the self-oppressor, the hypermasochist, she is me after all, and i have no room for self-hatred, so i guess i can stab her eye for that one. It is erotic, you see?), third, because it offered an outside solution to a marginalized and oppressed group's struggle-- which is unscientific and oppressive in itself to solve an oppressed group's struggle for them as the solution to oppression comes organically out of the oppressed, and fourth, because they were misogynistic and anti-feminist and generally reactionary, and fifth, because they were patriarchal and thus all of this now makes sense... the pederast movement originates in patriarchs who wish to return to a past. It is a patriarchal co-opt of the sexual revolution, it is... pederasty and pedophilia is spiritually heterosexual, and so, its inclusion in the sexual revolution is a psy-op, and the 'radical lesbians' that newgon insults actually were right to recognize them as spiritually heterosexual. youth liberation comes from the youth, i speak on youth liberation BECAUSE i am a youth (15, 8/21/26), animal liberation comes from animals (this is one of the three reasons i disagree with the ALF, 1 is because animal liberation must come from the animals, 2 is because they reject violence and violence is necessary for any revolution, 3 is because they are mainly anarchists.), the paraphiles' struggle will be solved not by paraphiles but by the subject of their attraction's liberation and the abolition of paraphilia that is including in the liberation / TRUE FREEDOM of love, which is, the abolition of sexuality for simply free and passionate sexuality. No more heterosexual, pedophile, homosexual, AAY (i will never identify as an AAY even

if i have always been attracted to adult men (and girls my age) because the term is dumb as fuck and rooted in radqueerism), lesbian, demisexual, asexual, zoophile, pansexual, aroace, whatnot... insstead, love and sexuality and whatnot is free from labels and limits, one jusst feels without category, one loves another (or does not love another) when one wants (or does not want). the labeling and identification with paraphilias and sexualities is part of the alignment of passions... plus, majority but not all of sexualities will be abolished naturally with the abolition of gender, as most sexualities are gender-based (on this, though, i heard that wittigian lesbians believe that lesbianism is also the rejection of man/woman as ideas and the abolition of gender itself, and that in a lesbian relationship, it is not two women in love, but instead, two genderless beings in a lesbian love-- this, i say, means genderless love can be appropiately called lesbian love, and lesboys is only the process of abolishing manhood by lesbianizing it, abolishing it is a process, and making the man into an agender concept, such as what happens to women in lesbian relations becoming genderless concepts.... camatte says homo gemeinwesen to refer to mankind in gemeinwesen, i say lesbian passionate community to refer to the lesbianism inherent in the passionate community, passionate communism is inherently lesbian... yes, despite my attraction to older men, i do hold in my heart a yearning for an equal and hierarchy-less lesbian relationship with another. the abolition of gender and the liberation of love and sexuality in the passionate community can be dubbed 'the lesbianization of the community', which in reality, is a part of the communization of the community, but by calling it the lesbianization it emphasizes the sexual liberation and free love aspects alongside the anti-gender aspect, that is, lesbianism is not nmlnm or wlw but love itself, liberated, lesbianism is free love itself, it is passionate love and sexuality, lesbianism is passionate and the passionate opposition to heterosexuality. It is not enough to be queer, one must be lesbian. okay, i feel like i have both overemphasized this and underemphasized this, i want everyone to be a lesbian, its the only way, fuck, fuck , if there are not-lesbians in communism then it is not real communism, or, passionate communism, a return to nature is anti-communist reactionary bullshit and so a path to passions is the true revolutionary way to passionate, real, communism, uhm,,,,, lesbians.)... not all, however, and that is why the abolition of alignment will abolish the rest.). Thus, i oppose child protection laws and youth safety laws and age verification laws are spectacular

illusions of 'caring about children' that, in reality, is used to further oppress and torment the youth. Say, if child safety laws actually keep children safe, why can i not walk alone at night without threat of child trafficking, huh? Why so many child groomers, huh? oh, and obviously the whole epstein thing that was terrifying and disgusting and revolting in the worst ways possible.... yeah. 8/21/26 6:41pm, i went to a random page of h.i. (words of the left, specifically), and it was my critique of bob black, fourier, and leftism... and i realize something. She, that is, myyself when i was wriitng H.I., the absolute abolitionist (she would kill me if she knew i would be calling her an absolute abolitionist months later after she denounced the use of the term abolitionism or abolitionist as an oppositionist term), poses to me a radical threat that i am not prepared to answer. J posadas, fuck. Of course, i can withstand her critique of the proletariat by claiming the communizationist periodization i have created, and i am a communist, and i do not have to deal with her issues with bob black and communizationists, but her critique of fourier, not the hyperculture nonsensical critique or the weird anti-cuban metaphors, but the dialogue between the posadist and the fourierist, that is the question that i cannot answer, a rather stupid one though. Maybe i can simply say that it (A.A.) is a genocidal impulse and that, really, it is not about perfecting the passions and destroying suffering, but abolishing alignment (and as a result, liberating passions and ending suffering)... but even while i say this, i feel unconvinced, i feel like such a response is half-assed, yet im sure going back to H.I. would only cause me absolute stress and disillusionment with no reason or rhyme so i reject a full re-reading of that text, i instead should say...not all answers are meant to be solved right away, let the cycle continue on until my death and beyond. also, regaining my love of the proletariat, i take back the bullshit i said about a united revolt of all beings if revolution was possible-- the revolution is possible, inevitable, and to be undertaken by the proletariat. 8/21/26, 11:27pm, a discord server i am in was raided. They sent gifs of a beheaded girl being fucked and a girl vomiting blood all over herself. I feel guilt, disgust, and attraction, this is making me feel sick. I have to admit this somewhere, i cannot keep this to myself, it is a disgusting feeling and i hate it. The headless body of that woman, i feel guilty, what the fuck. this is actually just. fuck. i shouldn't feel like this, this isn't the worst thing i've seen, but it was so unexpected and i didnt think it would. fuck. i feel like throwing up a bit. my stomach stirs. it was deleted by the

moderators and i can only thank god that it was destroyed, i never wish to see this again. the beheaded woman was being violated, i think this was snuff, how the fuck do people get this?? why???? its. this is different from the german cannibal thing, this was real rape victims who were murdered, it is revolting, what the fuck? what the fuck???? i can't get this out of my mind,. at first, it seemed like simple white skin moving and touching strangely in a mess of blood,, then it was clear to me, a woman naked puking blood, perhaps tortured, she was alive. I don't know why they sent that, some trolls. i fee lguilty. 12:31, i am reading georges bataille's on nietzsche. I feel better. 3:28am, i have finished the preface and part 1 of on nietzsche by georges bataille... here are the books i have collected for bataille:

Georges Bataille, On Nietzsche

Georges Bataille, Guilty

Georges Bataille, Inner Experience

'Georges Bataille', The Bataille Reader, edited by Fred Botting and Scott Wilson

'Georges Bataille', Visions of Excess, selected writings, 1927-1939, edited and with an itroduction by Allan Stoekl, translated by Allan Stoekl, with Carl R. Lovitt and Donald M. Leslie Jr., Theory and History of Literature, Volume 14.

these five books, or really, three selection of bataillean writings (SA, TBR, VOE). are what i will know about bataille as i finish. for now, i go to bed. For communizationism, i have all the endnotes issues, all the sic issues, and a number of dauve writings, that will be after bataille. for now, 3:34 am, i go to bed. 8/23/26, 3:44 am, i finished part 2 of georges bataille's on nietzsche, i am going to bed now.

8/23/26 1:57pm, gubby :3

do you appreciate it? This is what i do instead of finishing bataille's writings, i look at this weird roblox rabbit and call them cute. The rabbit does not appreciate the compliment, surely, and i do not appreciate wasting my time instead of reading bataille, but i am only but a small girl with little time. this is what a true communist looks like, this rabbit, gubby is a revolutionary ultra-leftist.

Gubby moggs jacques camatte and the unabomber. do you understand yet???? gubby.

gospel.

8/23/26: 7:06: i had to leave the only server i was active with and my main source of social communication due to it falling apart due to disgusting groomers and controversy surrounding the leader of the server, who was groomed and associates with child predators. this is horrible and disgusting, also i witnessed the beheaded woman again because of another raid.8/24/26, so, palestine and israel. The fact that, according to some leftcom news outlets, HAMAS is funded by israel or has been in the past and FATAH is so moderate they have defended zionism, and outside arab 'pro-palestinian' groups have done nothing, and the palestinian left-wing liberationists have done nothing (maoists there shoot at civilians and schools, carrying gonzalo's legacy, unsurprisingly), it is not surprising, right? HAMAS, ran by palestinian bourgeois men (new democracy is false and reactionary, remember! Capitalists work with capitalists, genocide is real but it is used as a spectacle of capitalist against capitalist when it is capitalist against the masses..), accepting funding by israeli bourgeois men? FATAH, the liberal slophouse who also are bourgeois, accepting moderate zionism and betraying their people to side with the oppressors, where have we heard that before (social democrats, FATAH is just another spd)! the PLO doing nothing.. not surprising, and i wouldn't be shocked if the maoists were funded by israel too. I will not talk about the pflp since they just do what every ML party does. But i mean, is it surprising that the organized opposition to genocide is funded by the colonial genociders??(no it isn't, antifascism (not antifa, i mean ANTIFASCISM, aka the united socdems of the left (ussr), and right (usa), together, to defeat overt fascism and generalize covert fascism..) was the success of fascism because antifascism was inherently fascist (antifa is inherently more anarchist, really, if we mean by antifa the current ancom groups against neo-fascism). too, the united statist forces against Zionism, aka, all the palestinian liberation groups ran by bourgeois men, of course what they really want is the continuation of zionist genocide and colonialism, because it is profit. The PA is inherently moderate-zionist (like mamdani (another socdem america is obsessed with because even a small lick of leftism excites them to the point of orgasm)), is inherently pro-israeli, and inherently against palestine ('palestinian'

'authority', wow, neither nor)...a true palestinian revolt, revolution, a real opposition to zionism must come from the palestinian proletariat, and for that matter, the international proletariat (wow, i sound like a leftcom now...), all the working men of the world (the israeli and white american proletariat may be brainwashed right now, lassalleanistic and reactionary, but this is to be overcome.. and plus, even in fascist states like the USA and Israel, there are anti-fascist anti-zionist far-left organizations-- israeli anarchists and FAUDA israeli members alongside palestinians for the end of israel as a nation, no-state-solution as it goes, and in the usa there are revolutionaries even if they are weak. every problem has one solution.), because the bourgeoisie also has no country, and no loyalty to any peoples. 8/26/26, 4:52 am, thinking back, i remembered a fear of mine that i had, because, once talking about cocks with my father (do not misunderstand, it is normal at least to my knowledge to shower together with your father, the conversation only arose due to that) in my elementary years, he had told me about circumsicion or whatever it was called, and i had misinterpreted it and thought that, inevitable, at some age, they'd pull out the pink head of my cock out of my cock and, in its place, would grow a dark-brown and desensitized new cock head-- and that they'd only do that if the cock head did not fall out naturally. it is a silly idea, really, but since this is also technically a diary, i wanted to share. an absurd fear, just stupid. I remember, too, elementary school years again, an obsession i had with erotic images, and, something i often dreamed later about after looking through it, images of my-little-pony brainfuck rape, a strange hypersadistic creation of autistic men on stupid edgy websites. I remember getting lost in the images of the horses' brains being literally shattered by the ejaculation of the queen, the guard, the older brother, whatever else, still a strange thing i enjoyed, yet i never really touched myself, just saw and lingered on it. Even today, i still wonder about its possibility, of ejaculating into one's brain, i think it's absurd but still interesting. typically, these brainfucking images were also necrophilic and gorey, and of course, fictional. 8/26/26 6:02, just about to head to bed, but.. i thought about bataille again as i just finished reading a section of georges bataille's on nietzsche, and about critiquing bataille, a worry i've had but i find i cannot do, i wish to, i cannot. I realize critique is, kind of, a sexual act-- it requires penetration, the mixing of two philosophers, fleeting unity where self-barriers, if only for a second, disappears, where it is just a mass of flesh and not two beings== it

requires for one not to realize the distinction between I and the other author's 'philosophy' (i cannot call myself a philosopher, that is an egotism i cannot stoop to), it requires for a mixture of the two, the dissolving of barriers between the two ideas, or systems, and then, it requires, finally, an escape from itself, a turning against itself, suicide, it requires for the mass of flesh to turn against itself. You penetrate, you fuck a philosophy, in order to turn it against itself, reduce it to nothing ,---- this is the distinction between sexual and asexual critique, if asexual critique can even exist, asexual critique is a critiquing of a philosophy without penetrating it, turning it against itself without penetration, if this is possible i do not know... sexual critique is the average penetrating and turning against itself, this is an important distinction,as typically one can dismiss a sexual critique for "being a misinterpretation" insofar as all interpretations and misinterpretations and we can never truly know-- an asexual critique would be a 'perfect critique' to the logical and rational one, a critique that cannot be critiqued, but in my opinion it is a pointless, useless, and boring critique, a critique without play, and quite possibly an impossible critique insofar as it may not even be possible. Self-critique here is masterbation, basically, self-penetration or, really, penetration of your past with your future in a fleeting moment of your present, and then, turning your past against itself via the future's penetration with the condom, the encapsulating reality, of the present, and thus destroying the past and present-- the condom breaks-- and leading way for the future, self-critique is masterbaition , or, incest, or, selfcest ('mirrorshipping' for the antishippers or whatever), or, autosexual activity, or, time-travel sex. It does bring up questions of consent, but again, this is only but a random thought, not a true statement, not reality. 8/28/26, taking a break of bataille after not being able to read him for maybe two days or so, i have grown an interest in wittig and will read her book, monique wittig's 'the straight mind and other essays', hopefully before my school starts. Thankfully, in my school, due to certain issues, i am in special education (at least that is what my 'very reliable' mother said, so if i am wrong about what it is, this is not my fault.) and thus can spend more time, hopefully, on this book-- or at least i think so, i did not research how special education classes work. I do, at least of what i know right now (by larping the fuck out of wittig), fully agree with her (or 'them', im not sure the pronouns of wittig), lets see what i have to say after reading maybe.

Already, in the foreword, there are a few mistakes on the nature of class and whatnot, and the radfem theory of genders being classes-- this is not true, of course, and the patriarchy, though serving the idea of the man (not exactly real men, since the men's lib existed for a reason, and transmen are oppressed for the same reason, that is, patriarchy is against queer men and men who are not 'the ideal man'.), is not a system of oppression of the woman class by the man class, in fact, it is quite literally more simply what it is, that is, the system of oppression (of multiple groups) by a heterosexual and often pederastic/pedophilic group of 'ideal men' who constitute an elite, usually all capitalists and/or statists. Non-binaries, children of all ages, women, trans and queer people of any gender and age and sexuality, and more (non-ideal men count here, though i really do not care much for the non-ideal straight man) are oppressed by this system, it is not exactly just a simple binary or dialectic. also the parallels between gender and age makes me wonder about a potential development of the youth liberation movement that i can suggest, that is, to be added onto my repetative and annoyingly ignored suggestions for youth liberation and its struggle to take on a feminist form and, to, mainly study, be inspired, and founded on a feminist basis and with feminist literature and history, specifically typically radfems as they were the most correct (even with a few massive mistakes that led to later anti-radfem TERFS who are only radfem in barely even name alone)... that is, actual communities by youth for youth, with the goal of the abolition of age via destroying the dynamics between age, to create ageless beings (this, naturally, also has to be lesbian, genderless, and i think any lesbian community that has failed to abolish age will most likely fail). though, i mean, i do not exactly understand how one is to comprehend the economic struggle between woman and man, adult and child (economically the struggle is, though (despite my burning hatred for the usually youthlib crude simplicity of the adult-child dualism, the 'adults are the oppressors' typical anarchist bullshit which opposes a radfem view of youthlib.), between adult and child in the way that feminist economic struggle is between man and women, when in reality, a true break is woman against capitalist patriarch, or, child against capitalist patriarch, without the conception of sex-classes or age-classes... Perhaps one can draw a distinction in the different TYPES of classes, such that bordiga can be right and wrong, that there is a distinction in classes liek the prole and the capitalist, and classes like the sex-class or age-class, but i am not exactly going to

leave myself to the vulnerability of trying to repair the contradiction between radfem/matfem conceptualization of classes and marxist/bordigist conceptualizattion of classes, instead i will allow this wound to fester and infect, and allow myself to still speak of age-classes and sex-classes here and say that patriarchy is, in fact, a system of (the intersection between an age-class and sex-class)'s domination over all other (age-classes and sex-classes, though gender means the basic same thing as sex-class here as sex-classes, ironically, modernly are based more off of gender than the social construct of sex. Transgender women are more oppressed than women, though this is not a competition, this shows that it is more based on gender than sex, and that there are divisions in the sex-classes--queer and non-cis men are oppressed by the ideal men of the patriarchy, so... it is complex. Young men, or, boys, are oppressed by patriarchy too, but in some cases they are given enough power (like some feminist youthlibs say in india) to oppress women regardless of age and fully identify and be accepted by the patriarchy.).

"For there is no ~~sex~~ age. There is but ~~sex~~ ages that ~~is~~ are oppressed and ~~sex~~ ages that oppress(~~es~~). It is oppression that creates ~~sex~~ age and not the contrary. The contrary would be to say that ~~sex~~ age creates oppression, or to say that the cause (origin) of oppression is to be found in ~~sex~~ age itself, in a natural division of the ~~sexes~~ ages preexisting (or outside of) society." --Monique Wittig, the category of sex, 1976-1982, Monique Wittig 'the straight mind and other essays', edited to point out something about modern ageists and even modern youths and liberal youthlibs.

and further...

"The class struggle is precisely that which resolves the contradictions between two opposed classes by abolishing them at the same time that it constitutes and reveals them as classes. The class struggle between ~~women~~ youths and ~~men~~ adults, which should be undertake by all ~~women~~ children is that which resolves the contradictions between the ~~sexes~~ ages, abolishing them at the same time that it makes them understood." --Monique Wittig, the category of sex, 1976-1982, Monique Wittig's 'the straight mind and other essays', now to point out how youth liberation is class struggle, one, and is, two, important for the creation of passionate communism--

all class struggles must end, including the one between the youths and their opponents. I think that, despite the (apparently to wikipedia almost a century old) struggle of youth liberation, first in youth movements and youth rights, or in youth struggles against child labour, then child rights and youth liberation, has not yet become conscious, class conscious, they still deny themselves... they still are not aware of themselves as a class struggle, and so, i am hopeful of a future youth liberationist struggle once they are aware of it being truly a class struggle, but i am pessimistic that it will happen when i myself am a youth, or even in my lifetime, perhaps after my death. It is inevitable. Also, too, my class have been severely stunted in this knowledge since the abolition of child labour in first-world countries and the spread of third-worldist new democracy and anti-imperialist capitalist bullshit, and while it may awaken once more at the sight of the horrors of the pedophilic elites, it will only be organized and properly militant if it is realized that youth struggle is class struggle. This is why the protests and struggles of child labour were the closest our class has ever been to a youthlib revolution, before the conceptualization of modern youthlib and the term youthlib, because the exploited and overworked wage-labour slaves that children were could realize that their struggle was economic, while today, we hardly ever realize that our struggle is an economic one, because we are decieved and stunted by the failures of our revolutions. the youth class in post-child-labour nations once child labour was abolished went from wage-labour exploited slaves to, properly, domestic (and "self-beneficial" (not really) labour) slaves, now we are slaves of the house who also do unpaid labour in schools, but the latter is justified because it 'only benefits us' and thus 'not real labour'. Still, we are slaves, thus it is economic, alongside that our labour is, still, ultimately labour and all labour is economic. Our struggle is a class struggle because, too, we are a class... though we forget that a lot, thus you here bullshit like 'capitalist children' even though there is no such thing, as much as during the wife-slave era there were 'capitalist women'... Most likely, nations with child labour will experience youth struggle before first world ones, simply because they understand it is economic more than us. Though, what i have historically heard, there was a spike in youth liberationist activity, with the supposed coining of the term youth liberationism, in the era of queer liberation and sexual liberation, this time viewing youth liberationism as an identity struggle (the same viewpoint that makes all modern youth liberationist groups ultimately fail,

the idea that youth struggle is an idpol thing and not a class struggle thing...), and advocating for more identity-based freedoms....

If the first Youth Liberationist spikes, the ones of child labour with a naturally socialist tendency, is to be called 'first-wave youth liberationism', then co-opted by adults to preserve the youth class in its domestic state, this second spike can be called second-wave youth liberationism, and has a confused progressive tendency, a liberalish one. Then, the youth liberation of the 2000s, that i call modern youth liberationism, is the third-wave (as of 8/28/26, in case i get lucky and the fourth-wave happens soon), which is born from the second-wave and suffers from the same issues and worse. The second wave was then co-opted by the pederastic movements and reduced to nothing, and the third wave of youth liberationism is exactly another degradation, from a progressive tendency to a liberal tendency... In the first wave, you hear about 'unions' and equal pay, about protest, about socialism (and arguably children as a class tend towards zerowork, thus how it was co-opted by adults in america and made into domestic 'non-working' (as the myth goes) slaves.)... in the second wave, you hear 'equal rights', you hear 'right to vote' or 'right to love', you hear about a want to generalize consent without abolishing age or the patriarchy. Pederasts co-opted this by abusing the sexual liberation section of the youth struggle and justifying child abuse and the return of patriarchal sex-labour slavery with it. the Third wave, you never really hear it... though there has been, apparently, more youth liberationists than ever, there aren't really many, or at least, many that are vocal. They also seem more concerned about other things... 'trans' kids, 'poc' kids, 'feminist' kids, 'proletarian' kids (contradiction on proletarian there), never KIDS. They also take a way more liberal stance, equating it to just the abolition of ageism without understand waht it means, they hate violence (or do not do much of it), despise sexual liberation among their ranks, and do not do protests as much (or really, anything.), and they see it entirely as an identity struggle, not an economic one, thus you hear about socdem youthlibs. They talk about familial support in youthliberation, a contradiction, they talk about unity with the parents or familial reforms (like in cuba) but never the abolition of the family model, patriarchy, age, and society/capitalism... they speak on reform, on gaining rights (modern youthlibs also called child rights), on liberalism for the youth, on right to vote (democracy is ageist, however), on lowering but not abolishing (not the age of consent but) the

age to vote and work... just, nothingburgers. It lacks content. This does not free our economic struggle, this just assimilates us like the liberal feminists. I hope, i pray, that the fourth-wave will be the wave of radical youth liberationists like myself (yes, i take back up my self-identification with the term radical youth liberation, sure!)! Maybe, with all the horrible shit going on, we have an actual youth liberationist class struggle, a proper militancy without liberalized and confused 'anarchist' nonsense! we want NOT the twelve year olds in the EZLN territories' conditions of life, neither the children in cuba's conditions of life, but radical liberation, absolute! A simple demand, really. And i do not fear the implications of this like the third-wave youthlibs do... yes, sexual liberation, yes, the abolition of the age of consent and age at all, yes, the abolition of families and the family model, yes, the abolition of work like my class tends me towards, yes. I know, 'i am advocating for abuse', but i am not, really. I am advocating for consensuality, for passionate community, for the abolition of alignment, for the death of reality, the dying of god-- well, here, i am advocating for the absolute and total liberation of the youth and all children regardless of age, regardless. I am advocating for freedom, for liberty, nothing else. reading this, i am preferring towards wittig's correctness on class and marx's mistake on class.... though wittig falls for the ignoring of intersex and ignoring that sex is a spectrum even as it is a social construct, just like gender... but, this makes little importance. Regardless, abolish all social constructs, as that is the correct way. also, i wish to correct myself a bit... as long as nature as existed, while gender did not exist, there has been an oppression and suffering of different sexes because of nature/god's cruel act, just like nature has classes and an economy it has sexes and quasi-patriarchal systems that are not exactly a patriarchy... like the animal ducks of the male sex who rape and brutalize usually ONLY ducks of the female sex, which implies an understanding of sex. I do not think all animals have sex as a social constructs, but clearly some do, because they suffer from sex-based violence nad suffering... this does not mean it is justified or that sex is not a social construct, because nature created all social constructs and, really, everything is natural (everything but the passionate community, which is not a result of but a break from nature, not the death of but a lack of god, the dying of god is not a natural dying but a state of paradoxical death, of being eternal and ended, eternal end but not ending eternality, the immortal unkillable's death where she is still alive as she is dead, a

godless god, a worldless world, a realityless reality, a community-less community, this is passionate communism, apostolic socialism.)... thus naturality does not justify it. Some animals have sexes and/or genders and thus have sexism and sexist oppression, but this does not justify it. heterosexuality does exist in nature, but it is not justified, nor is it natural for every species, but instead a form of oppression that develops over time, human society is a very, very. developed form of heterosexuality, and thus different from all other forms. Regardless, heterosexuality must go, and thus, sex and gender abolished for a passionate lesbianism. Heterosexuality is oppressive, abusive, harmful, worse than pedophilia (here, again, i speak of relationships-- though heterosexuality is a political regime that appears as a relationship, though the same thing can be said about pedophilia and pederasty.... wait, wittig is actually saying that heterosexuality is like pederasty, i get it now, because pederasty was a political regime and yet also took the form of relationships, coercive ones like the heterosexual relationship.... i digress, what i mean is attractions are not wrong or morally incorrect, attractions do not cause suffering thus cannot be 'bad' to my definition of the word. I mean pedophilic relationships, the pedophilic politican regime, the heterosexual relationship, the heterosexual political regime....), so it must be ended, destroyed, annihilated. it must be put to an end. But, oxymoronically, doesn't this contradict what i will say now, that is, that people reduce a child to their age and nothing else? No, it simply means that children have grown to justify their oppression and thus they argue not for their total liberation but for the liberation of everything but their age (a young feminist focuses on feminism but not on ageism in their political activism, thunberg despite, from everyone i have spoke about her too, being remembered mainly due to her age, does not talk about ageism even once as far as i am aware, she does not care for it-- but everyone i've talked about her to seems to care about how young she is first, then that she is an environmental activist). Children are still reduced to their age like a woman to their gender...

"The category of sex is the category that ordains slavery for women, and it works specifically, as it did for black slaves, through an operation of reduction, by taking the part for the whole, a part (color, sex[, age, species,]) through which the whole [being] group has to pass as through a screen." --Monique Wittig, the category of sex, 1976-1982, Monique Wittig's 'the straight mind and other essays', edited for another point about youth liberation.

thus, lesbianism as gender abolition, gender/sex abolition finds itself in a youth rejection of age, of being an aged individual... also, the family model and the pedo-erotic tensions at the root of the family, of age, and of the oppression of children, are all also not "natural" if that means that it is inherent to nature and is justified by nature, but are "natural" if that means that, like gender/sex and heterosexuality and patriarchy, it slowly developed from nothing/non-existent to what it is in human society now, that is, at a very developed stage (i mean, it is not natural if natural means "(the subject, which wittig here was speaking about here as male and female)...have always existed and will always exist." (Monique Wittig, one is not born a woman, 1981, Monique Wittig's 'the straight mind and other essays'), but it is natural, like everything else but passionate communism, if by natural we mean 'coming from nature, a result of nature', because everything is, and that is why nature is the enemy). this 'developed stage' means that it takes place or is 'actually born' in society, or, as others before me say, it is 'socially constructed' or a 'social thing not a natural thing', i do not see a difference between nature and social unlike them so this terminology means nothing to me. Also, 'human society' is not human, but human-dominated, as it currently reaches into and dominates and assimilated long ago all other species-societies, and therefore it iself is no longer a species society, but simply THE society that dominates all the species(plural), animals dominated by the homo sapien animal... i say this because i wish to stress that there is no nature outside of society right now, and there has never been and still is no society outside of nature right now, even tribes and hunter-gatherers right now are part of society insofar as the Survivalist international have maintained their existence and therefore introduce them as a part of (yet separate from) the society that we have, the international, no... the global society. The global society thus also dominates all animals and introduces the same struggles that humans have into animal culture, or, where animals already have struggles and bigotry, human culture intertwinning with theirs via species-colonialism makes it worse and quicker... animals in like the city or the streets are more parallel to humans than animals in society-dominated wilderness but they both suffer from species-colonialism and, and even before species-colonialism, they all suffered from bigotry and discrimination / developing forms of oppression among them. Species-colonialism only enhances it and strengthens it. I say this for no particular reason.

"Matriachy is no less heterosexual than patriarchy, it is only the sex of the oppressor that changes" --Monique Wittig, one is not born a woman, 1981, Monique Wittig's 'the straight mind and other essays'

(this is just to point out something i see among bio-essentialists of all forms, from radfem matriarchists to that weird group of youth supremacists who are all, strangely, adults and even pedophilic... they act as if flipping the roles solves anything but in non-human (animal) cultures there ARE cases of what our human culture would consider men being oppressed by what our human culture would consider women... though, i'd argue that, in we are to understand these cultures in human terms, this is still a 'patriarchy' insofar as if women are the second sex, the oppressed sex, the animal's 'matriarchal. culture here is just a culture where all women are born with penises, or are of the 'male' sex (social construct, again, and not all males have penises*), and men are born with vaginas and boobs, or are fo the 'female' sex (same thing as before*)... this is to say that matriarchy, a human matriarchy or otherwise, is not 'equal to patriarchy' but is, infact, patriarchy with a different name, where men are just the new women in the situation. In fact, when matriarchy is established, women become men, and men become women, not right away but after it is absolutely normalized and unquestioned.. thus, matriarchy is a paradox, it cannot exist. This is the same with children, but as far as i know there are not pediarchies in existence... stupid youth supremacists, or as i will call them, youthsups, make the same paradoxical argument. Children are only children in relation to adults, though they are different from gender in that it is more clearly a spectrum and that spectrum actually plays a role... In sex, the social construct, sex is a spectrum divided into three, women, men, and intersex... in gender, the social construct is more apparent, with millions of genders, but it still takes the form of three-- man, woman, non-binary for all the rest... children too, the oldest person was 122 years so thats 122 possible ages, and that isn't accounting for months, weeks, days, hours, minutes, seconds, whatever. But, age takes the category of three. Underage is the youth, minors, children (though this includes teenagers and famously adults try to claim that teenagers aren't children when it benefits adults and, when it benefits adults, they are children. Teenagers also have a tendency of age-chauvinism and see themselves as superior to, or not, children, that they are different and just 'unrecognized adults' and are not the same as children, when in reality they are children economically and the disunity only helps to harm them...

though, over 16 one could claim a difference in the economic relations, to that i say that 16-18 year olds are still minors and youths but are, because age is a spectrum and so is the divisions of the youth class, the most different sub-category... but still youths.), and whatnot... then, the adults and their subdivisions that i dont care about... then, the elderly, which i also do not care about,the elderly could be categorized as adults but they are treated as lesser than adults or sometimes higher than adults based on their overageing... its a question of culture, sometimes they are contradictingly both lesser and higher than adults, like in the usa' gentrocracy that also hates the elderly! THe thing is, basically, that children can technically have power dynamics with other children, but that is only in relation to the age of the child, or how close a child is to being an adult, because age, unlike gender/sex, is seen as teleological... children being children in relation to children do not originate in the for-itself of children, but instead, is related to the teleological idea of childhood towards adulthood where the child is more and more treated like an adult the closer they are to adulthood, creating disunity and power dynamics between the youth that leads to children assuming a role of the 'adult' in a child-child relationship... this means that while lesbianism is gender abolitionism, lesbians abolish gender inherently, child-child relationships (or 'puppy love'... to show another way in how this failed. Lesbianism destroys the myth of woman yet puppy love actually affirm the myth of youth, by portraying it as a romantic and pure love or, if it shows any trait or form of toxicity and/or abusiveness, the adults will point at it and yell how this proves that children are underdeveloped, not mature enough for love, incapable of handling or having romantic or emotional relationships, are inherently only able to have dysfunctional romantic or sexual relations, or that minors will only have sexual or romantic relations when pushed onto them by another adult or minor... either child-child relationships are pure youthful bliss or inherently toxic abusive shitholes of immature and non-consensual madness that is inherent to youthfulness, and the adults do not care to repair or explain this contradictory view on child-child relationships. This is, of course, not to deny the existence of COCSA, i do believe that COCSA exists, though i recognize that consensual child-child relations are also called COCSA in wester countries that does not mean i should deny that COCSA exists because again, it does-- youth are not perfect, they can be bad people too., they can cause to suffer too. But, what i was saying, again, uh,, i

digress.... i was saying that child-child relations are NOT the equivalent to lesbian relations, they fail to be lesbian, thus children cannot get a taste of agelessness.) lack this ability, and even communities for children and by children will have struggles between different ages, and abuse cases... and the segregation of different age groups would only affirm the existence of age and the relation of different ages to each other. Thus, children can not find any fleeting moment of age abolition anywhere, they must make it permanently.... I wish to stress here that lesbianism IS only a fleeting moment of gender abolition, one cannot have some reformism of 'oh well if everyone just became lesbian then we'd all be happy', and that isn't what wittig meant at all, lesbianism is only a grasping, a taste of what non-gender life is like, and gender is only abolished in revolution... in a lesbian revolution, a passionate revolution. Passionate communism is lesbian, so is the revolution, the revolution that IS communism IS lesbian. but reading (Monique Wittig, one is not born a woman, 1981, Monique Wittig's 'the straight mind and other essays'), i recall the myth of woman and see a parallel in the myth of youth, or more precisely of child, the myth of child.... which makes me wonder if, in the fourth wave of youth liberation, like there was in the first wave of feminism, there will be a confusion over this again, where they defend the myth of child, equality in difference... in the first two waves, this happened and resulted in the co-opting of the wave, and the third wave is so dead and unimportant it does not even need to be co-opted (though radqueers do threaten to do this again).. the first wave fell for the affirmation of the myth of child by making children no longer proletarian regardless of class they are born into, the deproletarianization of the youth, the second wave fell for the affirmation of equality in difference, which nambla spoke about and lanza spoke about to varying degrees alongside their persistence in the 'sexual liberation of the youth' in which they meant abuse.. the idea that children can exist in consensual families in consensually oppressive systems where they are consensually reduced to their age, a similar idea to third wave youthlib nonsense about consensual families and equal rights. well, then, we cannot let this confusion in the meaning of youthlib slide, i think, since wittig had rejected the term women liberation, yet... what to replace it with, anyways? THere is no lesbian equivalent to the youth and age abolitionism places not enough emphasis on the nature, thus i do not coin any new term for my theory on youth liberation, simply i call it, again, youth liberation since what else can i say? plus, in the end, i do disagree with

wittig on identity... the lesbian revolution will abolish the word lesbian because it itself is an identity, and one born out of necessity against oppression... though this makes little sense to focus on since there is no language or culture or words without nature, culture, or selves ("As for individuals, they are only the product of social relations, therefore their consciousness can only be 'alienated.'", Monique Wittig, one is not born a woman, 1981, Monique Wittig's 'the straight mind and other essays', this is a quote speaking about marxism' theory of the individual.. i think that here marx is correct, but that their consciousness is not what is alienated, but that they themselves are alienated in social relations and, they themselves, because they are made by alienation, and they are in this alienation alone, they as selves, as beings, are alienation, the self is alienation and will disappear, wither away, in the abolition of alienation, selves, individuals, beings, subjects, die out and fade in passionate community where alienation is gone... and selves exist as a given, a priori, because nature alienates them first, births them, all people are natural because they are naturally exploited. Thus self has to die in passionate revolution. Social relations cannot be without individuals, selves, and selves cannot be without alienation, so i do not think that social relations made selves by alienating them, but instead, nature made selves by alienating them, by creating them, as selves are their alienation, and they also are self-alienation as self is inherently alienating itself, they are eternal abysses of alienation, and that social relations, done by the self, do not make the self, but affirm its alienation, thus social relations are alienating but not the root of the self but a development of the self, which is not at all a good thing. Selves must die, revolutionary suicide, this is the passionate revolution.), so most likely there will be no words in passionate community anyways. But, since i do not wish to reduce passionate community into another utopia, i can only say things about passionate community within reason and explain why-- there will MOST LIKELY be no words in passionate community because words are from language and both words and language are from culture and are cultural, and it is a given that passionate community will be culture-less and culture will be abolished in the revolution, so any claim i make on passionate community without reasoning may be treated with a grain of salt-- i most likely had a reasoning but without reading it (because maybe i forgot to write it down or whatnot) one should not take it as fact or even a truth about passionate communism. still reading (Monique Wittig, one is not born a woman, 1981,

Monique Wittig's 'the straight mind and other essays'), now she is critiquing the marxist theory of class, the theory that bordiga and camatte posed against the student revolutionaries and marxists posed against feminism, and i am fully agreeing, maybe because i recognize that the idea that the youth are not their own class was kind of absurd if we relate class to a relation to the MOP (and that the reproduction of a class should not define a class, considering that the class itself is reproduced in other ways and still is maintained regardless of if the class itself is not independently capable of reproducing itself or being permanent). Though, she never actually argues against bordiga's definition of class (it must be able to reproduce itself or whatever), it does work to undermine his point entirely. And honestly, should the passionate revolution not be only a working class one but instead a revolution of ALL the oppressed peoples, considering that it is not a historically progressive revolution, not like any other, but instead a break with history, with teleology, with natural communism or normal communism--passionate communism is a break with history, it is not teleologically maintained nor scientific, it is irrational and soulist, it wishes to break with the history of god and her eternality and leave her hanging and suffocating in the air, it does not wish to perfect god like marxist communism does, it wishes to break from, annihilate god, end history abbruptly and abolish alignment, it is not the end of history becaause it is leaving history. Passionate communism is naturally anti-marxist, ironically, thus the passionate revolution should not follow the marxist revolutionary approach of a class, instead uniting the oppressed, miserable, slaves without masters against themselves, uniting all oppressed people against god, against history, nature, and for the passionate community. It is moreso a revolutionary post-fourierism i have wandered myself into again, but my utopian way of thinking simply cannot silence itself. this is also where i disagree with Monique Wittig (Monique Wittig, On the social contract, 1989, Monique Wittig's 'the straight mind and other essays'), on the foundation of her quasi-marxist idea of the nature of the sex-class (here i no longer care about reconciliating or not reconciliating the bordigist and radfem ideas of class, i am of the radfem idea of class wholely.) as "like serfs" (Monique Wittig, On the social contract, 1989, Monique Wittig's 'the straight mind and other essays')... not because they are not like serfs (which strangely does not imply that youth are like serfs, because youths actually are usually highly unable to change masters or run away from having

masters, they usually are killed, die of inability to do basic tasks that they need to in order to survive because society has closed off ability for children to do so unless the adults pity them enough to ignore the law or exploit the child (then we have homeless exploited parentless children), or in cases of orphans or runaways, orphanages or they are returned to old parents or given new parents with 0 consent. Even running away and CHOOSING new parents creates thousands of legal issues and whatnot, children cannot ever usually run away, and when they do, it is a huge and constant issue, or worse, death. And typically the ones who sucessfully run away have to get new parents or something, or last long enough to be 18 and be able to maybe get a job and not be in horrid poverty (though poverty is most likely without some charity shit). Women are like serfs, maybe, i do not care if they are or are not, but children are not like serfs, i still do not care if they are or are not however.), i don't care if they are or are not, but because it implies that serf-like escapist tendencies can solve the issue of patriarchy and heterosexuality, when this is false-- escapism has always failed for the left and leftism's whole tragedy is its escapism, the lesbian revolution is a break with the woman class' tendency towards serfish escapism, such that the same passionate revolution is also a break with the proletarian class' tendency towards affirmation and lassalleanism... While i do believe that the proletariat has now left the tendency towards lassalleanist affirmation and now is self-negating in tendency, that is, revolutionary, it is important to note that this tendency was not supposed to happen in marxist communism, and that the lassalleanist affirmation was meant to lead to communism in traditional marxism, and that the impossibility of lassallean communist revolutions-- that is the reality that lassallean movements are all pro-capitalist, are non-revolutionary-- alongside the proletariat's new self-negating self-abolishing tendency, its new communizing zerowork 'nature', this meant a break with the proletariat class' traditional conceptualization that has not yet exactly happened... while the proletarian class is tending towards communization, in a communizing stage, remember how i said how it is still covered in lassallean slop or whatever? I was wrong, it's moreso that this communizationist tendency has not appeared yet or made itself shown, we have not yet communized anything to really call it the communizationist stage, we are simply at the start of the stage waiting for a sign to confirm that the stage has started, and so, it's not a strong foundation to say that this communization is really a natural or 'teleological' or

'marxist' occurance, instead i think that marx was wrong here and that exactly the existence of communization and the future communizing revolution is a break with the proletariat' class nature, that is, lassalleanism-- now i bring back nature to draw a line between nature and tendency...the proletarian lassallean stage represents a marxist teleological nature, it is the nature of the proletariat and marxism at large, prole affirmation against capital -- now we know it is actually for capital--, the communizationist stage is not a stage at all, it is not part of communizationist class nature, it is an unnatural and passionate tendency and thus not a stage. THere is no self-negating communizing stage of the proletariat, communization is the abandonment of the proletariat's class nature, that is, it is the abolition of the proletariat therefore, such as lesbian revolution, lesbianization as i can call is, is the abandonment of the woman class' nature (serf-like escapism), that is, it is the abolition of the woman class therefore... And for both of these it happens at the same time as the abolition of the oppressors...communization abolishes worker and capitalist, and the whole spectrum of traditional marxist classes and capitalism/economy, such as lesbianization (my 'correction' if one can even call it that of wittig' serf-based approach or at least i think) lesbianizes everything, abolishes woman and man and the whole spectrum of gender/sex and gender/sex-classes and sexism/patriarchy/heterosexuality. Lesbianization is not lesbian separatism, but instead, lesbianizing everything that is currently heterosexual, aka, everything. And, to bridge the gap i have presented, it is important to note that lesbianization adn communization is one of the same thing... that is, TO communize is TO lesbianize and vice versa... Lesbianization/Communization is the lesbianization/communization of everything, the liberation of passions and annihilation of alignment, it abolishes all classes (thus it is also anti-speciesist and anti-ageist) and the spectrum of class and the economy and heterosexuality all at the same time, it abolishes all forms of oppression and alignment of the passions, all forms of alienation and everything else. One cannot communize without lesbianizing and one cannot lesbianize without communizing, capitalism is deeply heterosexual and vice versa... and both capitalism and heterosexuality are forms of limitation, alignment, and oppression and alienation of the passions, and are both intertwinned infinitely so with each-other... one cannot go without the other, and the passions cannot be free until both are gone. Lesbianizing is also a youth-liberationist thing by destroying the

patriarchy, the patriarchy cannot be destroyed if the family model and the oppression of the youth has not been abolished, and lesbianization will fail in patriarchy is not abolished, thus ageism and the oppression of youths must be ended in order for lesbianization to succeed, lesbianization is allied to youth liberation, youth liberation is a part of the process (and will be done by youths). Thus, lesbianizing will ahve to do away with age and gender alike, as one, against the age-gender system of the patriarchs, and as lesbianizing is one with communizing as both are the abolishing of class, so too is youth liberation, which is also the abolishing of class, when it is applied as a process (there is no term for the process of abolishing age-classes so idk). This is also the liberation of love, thus freeing love, 'free love' (and not the liberal or noveltist kind)... and thus paraphilic liberation. Too, in this process, it is absolutely necessary for absolute colour and racial liberation, and too, the liberation of all animals of all different species(plural)... thus, absolute liberation. Communization is absolute Liberation, the process of absolutely liberating... and now, still reading (Monique Wittig, On the social contract, 1989, Monique Wittig's 'the straight mind and other essays'), she has said it, the famous words that led me to discovering her or at least being interested in her, 'heterosexuality (...) as a political regime'. That is, a social contract of men that enslaves women, forced onto women without her consent, that creates women and men, and that the men delude themselves in thinking modernly and in the 20th century of women consenting to when that was never the case, like the association is a political regime against slaves so is heterosexuality a political regime against women (and arguably, if this political regime is also the foundation of the state and is also related to pedo-eroticism and pederasty and pedophilia in general, also against children... insofar as pederasty, which itself was a political regime against young boys, a social contract of patriarchs exchanging young boys where young boys are excluded but seem to be included in the agreement of the contract... like the patriarch do to women as well. I am saying that pederasty is NOT its own political regime but instead another manifestation of heterosexuality- Pedophilia, pederasty, is not 'most similar to heterosexuality', not it IS heterosexuality, an alternative expression-- still, here i refer to the relations and the expressiosn of political regimes, NOT the attractions themselves. I am saying that the political regime of heterosexuality expresses itself in multiple says, one is traditional man-woman heterosexuality, then we have Pederasty which was

an old traditional form of heterosexuality now reduced to an alternative form of heterosexuality, that is patriarch and eromenos (adult man and young boy), and then all the other alternative forms of expression of heterosexuality from pedophilia (adult man and young girl or adult girl and young boy or any form of pedophilia that includes a non-binary or intersex individual) to incest and sexual abuse, which arguably is also heterosexual, deeply so actually, insofar as it is an expression of heterosexuality. Thus, heterosexuality as a political regime is also the alignment or alienation of the passions, it also is part of the economy and its foundation, a part marx ignores, and part of society as a whole and its foundation. Heterosexuality expresses itself not only in heterosexual relationships but for now we recognize heterosexuality proper and pederasty as the msot clear, undifferent/non-unique, and most recognized and formally/currently popular examples, thus why NAMBLA was straight and had to be opposed by radical lesbians, who were in the right. Lesbianization thus is also a movement to be dominated also by young lesbians, in order to also abolish not just heterosexuality proper, but in maintaining that oppression must be abolished by the oppressed subject, these young lesbian children will also abolish the heterosexual expressions of pedophilia and pederasty (remember now that a lesbian is not a woman, and in lesbianizing there will be thousands of temporary-identifying lesboys who will soon enough be lesbians), that is, lesbianization must be the struggle of rejecting not just womanhood via lesbianism but also age via lesbianism, we must add-on agelessness to lesbianism. Lesbianizing is inherently age-abolitionist such as it is gender-abolitionist... it is not just a 'oh, it will do without it', not just 'another necessity', but one of the roots and desires of it, a majorly important necessity, a craving... lesbianization will lesbianize ALL forms of heterosexuality, including pederasty and pedophilia and heterosexuality proper, it will entirely lesbianize it. Thus, the 'lesbian' equivalent of children is 'lesbian', i am a radical lesbian, simple enough, even if this may seem contradictory to all of you reading. But, too, Lesbianization is also a critique of the old radical lesbian idea of lesbian separatism, which was fundamentally a utopianist, doomed to fail, solution, an escapism, and also a quasi-marxist failing to understand passionate community (most likely because passionate community as i theorize it right now did not exist then and was not their objective, lol). Lesbianizing is an alternative to lesbian separatism, a more likely to succeed alternative... it is passionate

communism in terms of how it relates to gender and age and heterosexuality, such as communization is passionate communism in terms of how it relates to class and economics and whatnot... communism is a perpetual state of communizing, remember? And yes, earlier, before one accusses me of such, i am saying that the family model is rooted in pedo-erotic tensions and that it is also the expression of these tensions, such that it should be categorizes as much as an abusive sexual action towards children as marraige is an abusive sexual action towards women, and both children and women are forced into it with no alternative. Pedophilia is actually extremely more common than one would think, look at all the families, there is a disgusting revolting feelign between them all of these tensions, relating to the pederastic roots of the patriarchy, nambla and the average father are not too different. I am not 'sexualizing the family', i am only doing that if i am also 'sexualizing marraige' when i speak of marraige too, i am just pointing out the aspects of the tensions of the family, a non-consensual tension. Also, it is very clear to me that this is also why modernly one cannot think of 'child' without thinking of some opposite of it, be it adult, parent, pedophile, predator, or the elderly, whenever i speak of youth liberation with adults they starting rambling on about pedophiles, when i had not even said a word about sexual liberation of the youth yet, nothing, they just ramble and ramble on because the first thing they hear with the word minor is the attraction to minors, ultimately children are only sexual things to them, sexual things they asexualize to maximize the child's appeal to them like they did with women, cover the breast in order to make it seem sacred and so even more attractive-- the myth of child asexuality in order to make them seem sacred and pure and even more attractive, it is the same thing. Another reason to want to rape women and children by the patriarchy, the only reason we have terms like woman and child is in relation to their defilement by a patriach. You are a child in relation to the head of your family, a patriarch, and if you have no patriarch you are a fatherless waste of life that needs to be bullied and live as a disgrace. although this definitely takes up importance in the dynamic of daughter and father, the historically most incestuous relation of the family model between any of the familial relations, this sort of feeling of disgrace and shame from fatherlessness originates more in father-son relations, and too, father-son relations are equally in their own right very incestuous and abusive, just less openly on display-- this father-son incest inherent to the family of a father and son is rooted

in pederasty, of course, think the ideal picture of a father and son and you jsut got yourself a nambla-ist's wet dream, simple as that. A son is in relation to a father, a daughter is in relation to a father, that is that psychoanalysis tries to use to justify the family, but it actually reveals that children are the slaves of the father (something obvious that everyone ignores) and that the child wishes, in reality, to escape this role, the role of childhood, that is why many children wish to be adults-- not a solution, however. THe solution is the abolition of age, lesbianization. heterosexuality reduces a child to their age, nothing but their fleeting moment of beign a certain age, that is, the development of their body and mind, something that to the heterosexual is sexual... children to the heterosexual is nothing but sexual, only sexual objects, thus one can say that the myth of child is actually surprisingly sexual, it is a sexual myth, it is that 'the idea of child itself is sexual'... thus rejecting it is rejecting one's reduction to just beign sexual, childhood is sexualization, constantly, this is very clear modernly with pedophiles just around the corner everywhere and was cleaar back during pederasty, and is clear again modernly with epstein. We only mean something in relation to our sexual attractiveness, our purity, our sexual appeal, to the patriarch, because we are children and thus nothing but our age. this is to be rejected, lesbianization is this rejection. It has been said that women are children in the past, but now, it seems that it is being said that children are women!). 8/30/26, while rambling to myself about how lesbian separatism is not the solution to sex-class struggle, i realized something. What i was trying to say is that communizationism (and lesbianizationism) is the REJECTION of one's class and class nature, really... the proletariat will always have a lassalleanist class nature, my periodization was wrong--- self critique to my periodization--- because fundamentally even in the real subsumption the proletariat remains lassalleanist, 'revolutionary' only in the way the french bourgeoisie was, that is, its own affirmation-- lassalleanism is the proletariat's class nature and this never changes-- a true proletarian revolt will lead only to a lassalleanist capitalism. Women, their class are like serfs, but that does not mean to follow the solution of serfs, lesbianization is not an escape but a rejection of womanhood via denying the class nature of tending towards serf solutions like escapism. Children as a class i do not yet know enough about, but it is clear they tend towards something non-revolutionary as seen via modern youthlib nonsensical bullshit and the lack of revolutionary activity among the

youth. Communization is not the new proletarian nature or tendency, it is not that after the failure of the lassallean phase we now must self-abolish because thats the periodization, nor is it that self-abolition has always been the solution and the class' nature and that there has never been a proletarian revolt... it is taht it is not a lassallean phase at all, the proletariat is lassallean, communization is a rejection of the proletariat's nature, and of the proletariat itself, it is like the anti-workists and zeroworkists... denial of class nature, breaking marxism and teleology, breaking history and destroying it... lesbianization is the rejection of the woman and child class, communization of the rejection of the proletarian class, and thus communization/lesbianization is the rejection of class, it is a revolution without a class, a classless community comes from a classless revolt. this also explains the lack of a communizationist revolt yet..because it is not, in fact, promised, it is not teleologically inevitable, it only results from a break from promises and inevitability, what is 'inevitable' is lassallean capitalism. as long as it is a revolt originating in the nature of the proletarian class, it is not a communizationist revolution. Thus, also why the solution of lesbian separatists are reactionary, because they are marxian... they are of the class. 8/30/26 3:38am, reading Monique Wittig, Homo sum, 1990, Monique Wittig's 'the straight mind and other essays', on the marxian dialectics and humanity-- this is another point of marxism i reject, thzt is, both the human (humanism is oppressive far-right bullshit that has only ever served the oppressor class against the oppressed, and served for justification for violence against oppressed groups via 'dehumanization' because of humanism) and class-based dialectical idea (wittig's theory on dialectics' nature to do with the one and the other) I wholy believe that passionate communism cannot happen by the same old historical marxian replacing the one with the other so that the other can be a new one, all classes are self-affirming (even if the people of the class can be self-abolishing, aka the potential of the proletariat, which i now place on all oppressed classes-- all oppressed classes are self-affirming, yes, but the people of the classes have a self-affirmation against their class, a want for a rejection of their class, this is the source of the self-abolishing tendency of the revolutionary, or, communizing. It is individuals that, alienated, oppose their class' self-affirmation by affirming themselves as beings, and thus lead to a tendency towards self-abolition in oppressed classes. All other classes before the proletariat have not actually abolished themselves because they were not representative of the

community's alienation, the bourgeoisie remained the same class before and after the liberal uprisings... Basically a dictatorship of the proletariat means the total self-affirmation of the worker class, lassalleanism, AGAINST the individual worker themselves, the being. the proletariat as a class, all classes are reactionary, the revolutionary potential lies in the individual of an oppressed class, the specific individual that is in conflict with being-- there is no negation, the being affirms themself against class affirmation and, in the revolution, abolishes itself to affirm the being's want, this is not self-negation, it is not negation, the being abolishes self to transform being into passionate being, which is selfless being, thus the being is affirming itself by transforming itself against self. Being is not self, it is not you, not person, not the unique, not any of that, not the ego, not me... thus, wondering on this being is not important to me. Then, there are no revolutionary classes, only revolutionary beings, and revolutionary beings are born from class alienation/oppression, from affirming themselves against class self-affirmation, from rejecting class, from communizing/lesbianizing. to be patriotic for one's class is stupid, i know the youth are a class and i feel no patriotism for them, only the individual beings that are prepared for passionate revolution, passionate being. and, to critique, not all beings who are alienated want communism, in fact not even most-- capitalists self-alienate yet they oppose communism, no? To say otherwise is to have the camattist sympathy for the capitalist slave.). Uhh fuck what was i saying. Well, negation first of all was never a concept i believed in, taking from the maoists... wait, not what iwas talking about. THe one and the other, dialectics, and humanity. First, a communist must be, first and foremost, an anti-humanist. Humanism is and has always been reactionary, nothing else. Second, a communist revolution is not to follow the historical path before us, not to replace an one with an other and let that post-other (the new one) create new others or oppress ignored third others, that is to first follow the natural path and second follow a reactionary path... Communism must be the break with nature, history, it must be a rejection of this path, the end of ones and others, no dictatorship of the proletariat and no dictatorship at all! It must be no longer a natural or historical thing, nor dialectical, communism is the affirmation of the community against that which alienates it, that which subsumes it., and/aka god. Simply, communism cannot be marxist, marxian, dialectical, historical, anything. 8/30/2026 and uhmmm sooo... about accelerationism, and specifically g/acc and

gender accelerationism and cute accelerationism and fem/acc, yeah i think it is clear that all these ideas are inherently flawed due to the unstable foundations of accelerationism and their influence from nick land's torn and schizo-larping philosophical base. nick land was obviously wrong, but that is not what i want to speak about. The gender shredder and my old theories on it was inherently opposed to, even if it seemed as a path to, gender abolition-- gender accelerationism as a way to gender abolition is rooted in the obviously wrong and teleological, the historical, the incorrect idea of abolitionist accelerationism as i will call it. that something can affirm itself so much that it collapses, or, that one can accelerate (thing) into it is abolished. this is simply wrong exactly because affirmation cannot logically lead to collapse, all things work for their continuation, and collapse can only come from the affirmation of a being. Capitalism will not die from its own acceleration, it thrives in acceleration, it only dies in the revolutionary process. Too, even technology despite it all finds that it is and will not die of it, it will affirm itself, capitalism will accelerate it constantly, and instead of collapsing like the unabomber theorized it inevitably will, it continues on, because it thrives. Too, gender cannot be accelerated into abolition, the gender shredder will not just happen, gender is a result of heterosexuality (and heterosexuality is the result of gender, both the same and developing the same times by god's self-abusive madness) and thus heterosexuality, even when accelerated, will not shred gender and so nor will it shred itself in the process. The gender shredder cannot exist, cannot function, because it assumes that heterosexuality can turn against itself... Wittig failed because like a marxian she wished to follow class nature, and so, run to lesbian separatism or her radical lesbian ideas, and nix land fails because she assumes practically inevitability, that the gender shredder, teleological, coming, heterosexuality accelerated by capital or whatnot, will shred gender and heterosexuality and thus abolish man and woman, thus 'lesbianize' to use my own term for it, but this is untrue. Lesbianization cannot come from anything but the being, but radical beings, and ultimately i am sure not everyone will lesbianize, surely some will run off like separatists away from the passionate community, i am no utopian. Lesbianization cannot come from teleology, it cannot be promised, it cannot be historical or inevitable, it cannot be from capitalism or heterosexuality or gender, but from beings rejecting their oppression under their oppressed sex-classes and oppressed age-classes. It is not

nihilization, really, though nihilization is necessary to some degrees. Lesbianization comes from within, like communization, not from social processes, it comes from a rejection of one's slavery, of oneself and god. The gender shredder is a marxianized lesbianization, basically, and should be as good as rejected. Radical Lesbianization, the process of lesbianizing, rejecting gender, is not an inevitable shredding process. It is lesbianization, simply. Cute accelerationism is too esoteric and unclear, and fem/acc was a hyperborean sickness, nothing else to say. This is to separate lesbianization, communization, from these backwards ideas.

"(...) and lesbianize them, lesbianize the symbols, lesbianize the gods and the goddesses, lesbianize the men and the women." --Monique Wittig, The Mark of Gender, 1985, Monique Wittig's 'the straight mind and other essays'

"(...) and communize them, communize the symbols, communize the gods and the goddesses, communize the men and the women." --Monique Wittig, The Mark of Gender, 1985, Monique Wittig's 'the straight mind and other essays', edited to say something old.

and so on... 8/31/26, i have finished Monique Wittig's The straight mind and other essays!! It was a good read.